DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 853 FL 027 192

AUTHOR	Daniel-White, Kimberly, Ed.
TITLE	Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 2001.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	132p.; Published biannually. For individual articles, see FL 027 193-98.
AVAILABLE FROM	Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Language in Education Division A-12, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (Regular subscription, $8 per issue). Tel: 215-898-3288; Fax: 215-573-2109; e-mail: wpel@gse.upenn.edu; Web site: http://www.gse.upenn.edu/wpel/.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v17 n1-2 Spr-Fall 2001.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Asian Americans; Cultural Influences; *Cultural Pluralism; Discussion (Teaching Technique); Elementary Secondary Education; Ethics; *Ethnicity; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Immigrants; Korean; Language Usage; *Linguistics; Literature; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Complaints; Hedges (Linguistics); South Africa; University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This volume contains the following articles: "Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of its 25th Anniversary" (Nancy Hornberger); "Constructing a Multicultural National Identity: South African Classrooms as Sites of Struggle between Competing Discourses" (Keith Chick); "Ventriloquating Shakespeare: Ethical Positioning in Classroom Literature Discussions" (Stanton Wortham); "Culture, Identity, and Asian American Teens: A School District Conference Panel Discussion" (Angela Reyes); "Avoiding FOBs: An Account of a Journey" (Mihyon Jeon); and "'That's Too Bad': Hedges and Indirect Complaints in 'Troubles-Talk' Narrative" (Mark Ouellette). (Each paper contains references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Volume 17
Number 1 & 2
Spring/Fall 2001

ED 462 853

working papers in educational linguistics

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Donnelly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

FL027192

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
2

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

WORKING PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Editor-in-Chief	Kimberly Daniel-White
Editors	Cristi Alberino Emily Cruse Jennifer Freeman Jeffrey Kralik Mark Ouellette Angie Reyes Diana Schwinge
Faculty Advisor	Nancy Hornberger

Language in Education Division
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Division Faculty	Susan Lytle, Chair Morton Botel Yuko Goto Butler Vivian Gadsden Nancy Hornberger Teresa Pica Lawrence Sipe
Division Programs	TESOL Educational Linguistics Reading/Writing/Literacy Intercultural Communication

WORKING PAPERS IN EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS

Volume 17, Numbers 1 & 2 Spring & Fall 2001

Contents

Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of its 25th Anniversary
Nancy Hornberger 1

Constructing a Multicultural National Identity: South African Classrooms as Sites of Struggle Between Competing Discourses
Keith Chick 27

Ventriloquating Shakespeare: Ethical Positioning in Classroom Literature Discussions
Stanton Wortham 47

Culture, Identity, and Asian American Teens: A School District Conference Panel Discussion
Angela Reyes 65

Avoiding FOBs: An Account of a Journey
Mihyon Jeon 83

"That's Too Bad": Hedges and Indirect Complaints in "Troubles-talk" Narrative
Mark Ouellette 107

Dear WPEL readers,

We are proud to bring you the latest issue of the University of Pennsylvania's ***Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*** which celebrates the 25th anniversary of Educational Linguistics at Penn. The work contained in this collection represents the diverse interests and research projects of the students and faculty associated with the Language in Education Division.

Our mission is to share the current and on-going work of our students and faculty with our worldwide readership. We also aim to work with our contributors to make their "working papers" into scholarly articles ready for publication.

In this issue:

Nancy Hornberger traces the beginnings of educational linguistics at Penn by describing the specific characteristics of the program. She concludes her article by considering educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines.

Keith Chick, a visiting professor from South Africa, reports on an ethnographic study of classrooms in post-apartheid South Africa providing evidence for schools as sites of struggle between competing discourses.

Stanton Wortham analyzes classroom discourse describing how students and teachers take ethical and political positions which have implications for their roles in society as well as pedagogical implications.

Angela Reyes provides an analysis of discourse during a school district conference panel discussion showing how Asian American teens and the audience of teachers, advisors, and administrators differ in their construction of culture.

Mihyon Jeon takes readers on an ethnographic journey showing how Korean-American college students' use of the term FOB connects to their ideologies about both Korean and English.

Mark Ouellette compares the structure of "troubles-talk" narratives between Korean, French and American women showing similarities and differences in narrative syntax of the different groups.

In addition to our advisor, Nancy Hornberger, we gratefully acknowledge the following individuals whose help and cooperation made this publication possible: Penny Creedon, Lorraine Hightower, Suzanne Oh, and Mary Schlesinger.

We hope that you find the following contributions as engaging and worthy of scholarly interest as we have.

The editors

Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of its 25th Anniversary[1]

Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania

Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education traces its beginnings to 1976 and the deanship of Dell Hymes. This paper takes up various aspects of the practice of Educational Linguistics at Penn, discussing them in relation to issues that have been raised in the literature about the definition, nature, and scope of the field. Three emphases which have characterized Penn's Educational Linguistics are considered: the integration of linguistics and education ("the relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse"); the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice ("a problem-oriented discipline"); and the focus on language learning and teaching ("scope with depth"). The paper concludes with a consideration of educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines ("birds on a wire"). It is my hope that this exploration of a particular set of practices might contribute to the advancement of the field of educational linguistics.

Introduction

In 1972, Bernard Spolsky proposed the title "educational linguistics" for a discipline whose primary task would be "to offer information relevant to the formulation of language education policy and to its implementation" (1974c:554). He affirmed that it "should be a problem-oriented discipline, focusing on the needs of practice and drawing from available theories and principles of many relevant fields including many of the subfields of linguistics" (1975:347). Shortly thereafter, two doctoral programs in Educational Linguistics were inaugurated at U.S. universities – one at the University of New Mexico, directed by Spolsky and closely linked to the Navajo Reading Study being carried out there and one at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, inaugurated

[1] This is a slightly revised version of a paper that originally appeared in a volume honoring Bernard Spolsky: R. Cooper, E. Shohamy & J. Walters (Eds.) (2001) *New Perspectives and Issues in Educational Language Policy: A Volume in Honor of Bernard Dov Spolsky*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

under the aegis of Dell Hymes and the direction of Nessa Wolfson.[2]

Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania traces its beginnings to 1976, when Hymes appointed Wolfson lecturer in education and assigned her the task of creating the Educational Linguistics program, which would come to encompass not only the Ph.D. specialization but also a master's specialization in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and soon thereafter (1978), another master's specialization in Intercultural Communication.[3] In the ensuing years, the program took on additional faculty: Teresa Pica, one of the first graduates of the program (Pica 1982), was appointed assistant professor and director in 1983[4] and I joined in 1985; after Wolfson's untimely passing in 1989, Rebecca Freeman was recruited as third member in 1992 and served until 2000.[5] As Educational Linguistics at Penn celebrates its 25th anniversary, it seems appropriate to take a retrospective and prospective look at this program's approach to the practice of educational linguistics.

In keeping with Spolsky's initial formulation that educational linguistics should take the practice of education as its starting point, I will begin from the practice of educational linguistics in the Penn program, moving from there to implications for the field as a whole (rather than the reverse). In the sections which follow, I take up various aspects of the practice of educational linguistics at Penn and discuss them in relation to issues that have been raised in the literature about the definition, nature, and scope of the field. I conclude with a brief comment on the relationship of educa-

---

[2] Recently, two other Educational Linguistics programs have been initiated. In the 1990s, the Monterey Institute of International Studies changed the name of the Department of Language Studies to Graduate School of Languages and Educational Linguistics (Leo van Lier, personal communication, 7 November 1998); the School offers advanced language courses (usually content-based in several disciplines) and masters' degrees in TESOL and TFL (Teaching Foreign Language), but no doctoral degrees. As of 2000, Stanford University School of Education offers a Ph.D. specialization in Educational Linguistics within the Social Sciences, Policy and Educational Practice area. At the University of New Mexico, Professor Leroy Ortiz, student of Bernard Spolsky, currently directs the Division of Language, Literacy and Sociocultural Studies which houses the Educational Linguistics program there. So far as I know, these, with the Penn program, constitute the only Educational Linguistics programs to date, although a number of related programs in Language and Literacy, Language in Education, or some variation thereof, emerged in the 1980s (more on that below).

[3] In the budget climate at Penn at that time, creating masters specializations alongside the doctoral specialization was seen as a wise strategic move, since the masters students could provide tuition dollars that would help support the doctoral specialization (Hymes, personal communication, 26 October 1998). All three specializations continue to operate to the present. While all form an integral part of the Educational Linguistics program, the focus here will be on the doctoral specialization only.

[4] Professor Teresa Pica is the single person with the longest affiliation to the program, having begun there as student shortly after its establishment and continued on as professor until the present. I would like to acknowledge here the profound influence Pica has had on the development of the program, on the professional development of its students, and indeed on my own academic career.

[5] As this article goes to press, Educational Linguistics again welcomes a third faculty member, Yuko Goto Butler, and is in the process of searching for a fourth to join in Fall 2001.

tional linguistics to applied linguistics and other disciplines. It is my hope that this exploration of a particular set of practices might contribute to the advancement of the field of educational linguistics.[6]

Educational Linguistics defined

The Educational Linguistics Ph.D. specialization at Penn is one of nine doctoral specializations offered at the Graduate School of Education. The Educational Linguistics handbook introduces the doctoral specialization in the following way:

> "The Ph.D. specialization in Educational Linguistics integrates scholarship, training, and research in linguistics as they relate to theory, practice, and policy in education. The specialization maintains a perspective on issues in linguistic and cultural diversity and approaches to language learning and teaching that embraces local, national, and international interests.
>
> Research interests of Ph.D. candidates currently enrolled in Educational Linguistics include: second language acquisition; language choice, maintenance and shift; language and ethnicity; descriptive analysis of speech acts and discourse; educational implications of linguistic diversity; language planning; bilingual education; spoken interaction in professional settings; and biliteracy. Graduates can expect to find teaching, administrative, and research positions in colleges and universities, and administrative, research and advisory posts in government, community and private organizations.
>
> All students enrolled in this program are expected to gain a solid foundation in linguistics. For this purpose, students take courses in the Department of Linguistics as well as in the Graduate School of Education" (Educational Linguistics Handbook 1999-2001:19).

The above introduction offers a brief definition of educational linguistics, as well as a suggestion of its scope and relationship to linguistics. The handbook goes on to outline a 20 course curriculum, including seven core courses, four distribution courses (two in linguistics and two in education), and two research methods courses, as well as inquiry skills, candidacy, comprehensive examination, and dissertation requirements.

---

[6] I write from the perspective of one affiliated with the program since 1985 as professor, for many of those years as director. Mine is in many respects a personal, and undoubtedly biased, perspective, but it also affords the benefits of insider knowledge.

Beginning with the first Educational Linguistics Ph.D. in 1981 (Zentella 1981), the Faculty of the Graduate Group in Education has approved more than 75 candidates for the Ph.D. degree with specialization in Educational Linguistics, approximately three-quarters of them women and over one-third international.[7] Consistent with the professional positions outlined in the above introduction to the program, graduates have gone on to hold academic, research, and administrative posts in institutions of higher education across the country and around the world, in departments of education, linguistics, applied linguistics, English, English as a second language, foreign language education, multilingual-multicultural studies, anthropology, Japanese language and literature, and Black and Puerto Rican studies, and in international and intensive English language programs, among others.[8]

The conception of educational linguistics enunciated in the program handbook, with its emphasis on the integration of linguistics and education, the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice, and on language learning and teaching as the core focus, is consistent with the field as it has been both explicitly and implicitly defined in the literature. Spolsky's definition, above, specifies that the discipline should focus on language education policy and implementation and that it should take a problem- and practice-oriented approach, and these are the crucial characteristics he returns to again and again in his writings. In introducing the section on educational linguistics in Current Trends in Linguistics, he writes that he and the contributors set out "to show how linguistics and its various fields can help define and solve problems that reflect the centrality of language in the educational process" (1974a:2024), again alluding to the focus on language in education, the problem-solving orientation, and the link to linguistics. In his volume entitled Educational Linguistics, he goes on to write that "the field of language education must depend on a wise, soundly-based, but modest set of principles and practices derived from the relevant theoretical and empirical disciplines. It is the primary task of the field I call educational linguistics to provide such a basis" (1978:175). Here again, he takes the practice of language education as a starting point and looks to educational linguistics to draw from relevant related disciplines to provide needed principles to guide that practice. Like Spolsky, Shuy also sees an important role for educational linguistics in relating linguistics and its subfields (e.g. sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics) to relevant teaching

[7] International doctoral graduates have been from: Botswana, Brazil, England, Germany, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Taiwan, Turkey, and Zaire.

[8] Graduates hold tenure-track or tenured faculty positions at, for example, the following universities nationally and internationally: Georgetown, New York University, University of Florida, University of Illinois, University of Puerto Rico, University of Wisconsin, LaTrobe (Australia), University of Botswana, University of Rio de Janeiro (Brasil), Waseda (Japan), Suk Myung (Korea), Universiti Teknologi (Malaysia), Aga Khan (Pakistan), Donghwa (Taiwan), and Bogaziçi (Turkey).

and learning (1981:460), and Pica sees it as a problem- and practice-based field "whose research questions, theoretical structures, and contributions of service are focused on issues and concerns in education" (1994:265).

Others define educational linguistics implicitly by what is or is not included in their discussion under that title. Stubbs' volume entitled Educational Linguistics (1986) is perhaps the most elaborate of these (we will return to his view of educational linguistics below), but others have also approached it this way. Under the title of educational linguistics, Smitherman (1979) addresses herself to black linguistics, Suardiaz and Domínguez (1987) to mother tongue teaching, Myers (1994) to second language teaching, and Freeman (1994) and Brumfit (1997) to language teaching. None of them explicitly define what they mean in using the term, but by implication include their particular topic within the scope of the field; moreover, their discussions advocate the same emphases on the integration of linguistics and education, close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice, and a focus on language learning and teaching, as articulated in the more explicit definitions of the field above.

Van Lier, on the other hand, at the 1994 Georgetown University Round Table on Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence (Alatis 1994), approaches the definition of educational linguistics explicitly in terms of its substantive content, but posits that in fact it does not exist "as an academic field, subfield, profession or discipline" (1994:200). Following Bourdieu (1990), he defines a field as a "historically constituted area of activity with its specific institutions and its own language of functioning" (van Lier 1994:203) and suggests that for a field of educational linguistics to exist, there would have to be departments, programs, (doctoral) degrees, courses, textbooks, materials, and insights proper to it (1994:207). At the same conference (but speaking in reference to the field of language testing), Spolsky suggests that "to be considered a profession, a calling needs to have a number of attributes, such as professional associations, textbooks, training programs, journals, conferences, and certification" (1994:88). I suggest here that, based on a practice of 25 years and by criteria such as those proposed above, educational linguistics has indeed earned the right to be considered an academic field. We will consider the nature and scope of the field in terms of the three emphases alluded to above: the integration of linguistics and education ("the relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse"); the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice ("a problem-oriented discipline"); and the focus on language learning and teaching ("scope with depth"); after which, we will conclude with a consideration of educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines ("birds on a wire").

The relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse

Anthropological linguist Dell Hymes agreed to become Dean of the

Graduate School of Education because he "believe[d] profoundly in the need for change in the way we understand language, and in what we do with language in schools" (1980:139). It is not too surprising, then, that one of the first things he did was to inaugurate Educational Linguistics with the appointment of Wolfson. Educational Linguistics was housed in one of four newly created Divisions in the school, the Language in Education Division (LED), along with several existing programs which eventually became unified as the Reading/Writing/Literacy program. This alignment has enabled Educational Linguistics students to benefit from language education fields such as Reading and Language Arts, Children's Literature, Rhetoric, and Adult Literacy, fields that have traditionally been kept separate from language teaching.

Situating the Educational Linguistics and Reading/Writing/Literacy programs in close proximity and under one administrative head has over the years led to greater coherence and complementarity between them, to their mutual strengthening; indeed, as the literacy field has evolved to take social, cultural, political and historical context into account (e.g. Street 1984, 1993), it has become increasingly difficult and undesirable to separate the study of language and literacy practices in any setting, in any event. Evidence of this merging of interests can be seen, for example, in the student-edited Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, which announce all of the programs in the Language in Education Division and highlight a selection of divisional courses encompassing reading/writing/literacy as well as educational linguistics offerings, as follows: Sociolinguistics, TESOL Methodology, Structure of English, Educational Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, Language Diversity in Education, Multicultural Issues in Education, Classroom Discourse and Interaction, Language Planning and Language Policy, Social and Historical Perspectives on Literacy, Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners, and Forming and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum.[9]

[9] Similarly, a number of Language and Literacy graduate programs / departments / divisions / centers have emerged in schools of education at various U.S. and international universities since the 1980s, including University of California at Berkeley (Language and Literacy), University of Arizona (Language, Reading, and Culture), and an increasing number of programs in Language, Literacy, and Culture, e.g. at University of Colorado - Denver, and University of Maryland - Baltimore County, among others, in the U.S. International examples include the Centre for Language and Literacy at the University of Technology in Sydney, Australia and the Centre for Language in Education at the University of Southampton, UK. Of course, there are myriad programs in applied linguistics or TESOL or bi(multi)lingualism-bi(multi)culturalism or literacy, but I am highlighting here specifically those programs that unite language education and literacy education concerns under one institutional umbrella. One set of programs that appear to have developed along very similar lines to the Language in Education Division programs at Penn are the Literacy and Bilingualism Research Groups and the Centre for Language in Social Life at the Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language, University of Lancaster, UK. More recently, Brian Street and colleagues at King's College London have configured a Language in Education department there, drawing explicitly on the model of Penn's Language in Education Division where Street has held a visiting appointment for more than a decade.

From its beginnings, Educational Linguistics also sought to maintain ties with the Department of Linguistics in the School of Arts and Sciences.[10] To this end, there are a number of institutionalized reciprocities. As mentioned above, Educational Linguistics requires that all its students take a minimum of two courses in Linguistics; for their part, the Linguistics department offers Educational Linguistics as one of eleven areas of study from which their students choose four for their qualifying examinations. Two Educational Linguistics faculty have been appointed members of the Graduate Group in Linguistics; and reciprocally, there have been secondary appointments of Linguistics faculty in the Graduate School of Education. Faculty of both programs serve as needed on dissertation committees or faculty review committees in the other program. Research articles by faculty in one program may appear on course syllabuses in the other and vice versa. There is informal interaction as well, including occasional invitations to present brown bag talks and participate in locally organized conferences or working papers series. Of course, as with any other innovation, and continuing program, there have been differences of opinion, and tensions, across programs both within and outside of GSE. On the whole though, there is acceptance of autonomy within programs and at the same time a mutual recognition of the relevance of one field to the other.

The proposal for a field of educational linguistics was premised on the mutual relevance of linguistics and education (Spolsky 1974a:2021). Van Lier spells this out, arguing for the relevance of education to linguistics in terms of (a) the way in which linguistics is taught to future and current teachers and (b) classroom interaction data for linguistic theories; and reciprocally for the relevance of linguistics to education in terms of (c) language and content teaching in first language / second language classrooms, (d) language across the curriculum, (e) school-community information flow and discourses, (f) school to work discourse transitions, (g) critical linguistics, power and control in classrooms and schools, and (h) classroom interaction, this last which he sees as the core of the educational process and of educational linguistics research (1994:204-207). As van Lier points out, though, the argument for the relevance of linguistics for education has on the whole been more readily apparent and accepted than the inverse relationship (1994:204).

In his text *Educational Linguistics* (1986), Stubbs takes a strong stance for the relevance of linguistics to education, arguing, in terms reminiscent of Spolsky's call for a problem-oriented discipline, for the value of a research paradigm in Kuhn's (1962) sense, which "tackl[es] a well-articulated set of problems in well-defined ways, with agreed standards of solution and explanation, and drawing on a consensus of theory" (1986:233-234). He points out that it is important to distinguish between language in education and linguistics in education (1986:34), referring to the need to study language

[10] Hymes was a faculty member in Linguistics and Wolfson had earned her doctorate there.

"in its own terms" (1986:232), as a discourse system, rather than treating "language at the level of isolated surface features, ignoring its abstract, underlying, sequential and hierarchic organization" (1986:243); and he suggests that discourse analysis can be applied to education in direct teaching about discourse and communication and in the study of classroom discourse (1986:31, cf. van Lier's 1a and 1b above). Stubbs' text addresses what educators (educationalists, in his usage) need to know about linguistics and how to teach it to them, taking up in turn such English language education problems as the teaching of vocabulary, reading, and writing.

While there has been a general consensus on the relevance of linguistics for education (and far less attention to the relevance of education for linguistics), there is less clarity and perhaps a certain wariness as to the nature of the relationship between them: is it application, implication, interpretation, or mediation? Coexistence, collaboration, complementarity, or compatibility (Pica 1997)? In his early programmatic statements, Spolsky argued that linguistics has applications to and implications for education (1974b:2034), both directly through language descriptions and secondarily through linguistic subfields like sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics (1978: 2-3; cf. Shuy 1981:460). Yet, he was careful to note that while linguistics can contribute language descriptions to inform language teaching, a description is not a prescription for teaching (1978:2-3) and he urged "steering clear of excessive claims that have caused so much damage to all concerned" (1974a:2021); he emphasized that educational linguistics "should not be, as it often seems, the application of the latest linguistic theory to any available problem" (1975:347), but rather a problem-oriented discipline focused on the needs of practice (see the next section below).

While the metaphor of "application" will probably be with us for a long time,[11] scholars have recently argued that a view of educational linguistics as applying - or even mediating or interpreting - linguistic theory for the practice of education suggests an inappropriately hierarchical view of the knowledge base of language teaching (Freeman 1997:194). Stubbs traces a shift in views on the relation between theoretical and applied linguistics in similar terms, from a view of applied linguistics as mediating (interpreting) theory for teachers, to the view that applied linguistics should develop its own model of language. He argues that analysts' (linguists') and users' (teachers') models are radically different and indeed must be so due to differing aims; analysts need precision for validity and users need a degree of imprecision in order to communicate effectively (Stubbs 1986:249).

"Educational linguistics cannot just be linguistic theory applied to educational practice, ... rather the relationship must be reciprocal and dynamic" (van Lier 1994:203; see also 1997:97, 101). Pica (1997) celebrates the growing number of relationships available to teachers and researchers, among them coexistence of activities, collaboration of efforts, complementarity of

[11] For one recent example, see Kachru 1994:19 on the application of educational linguistics for exploring the cross-cultural dimensions of world Englishes.

contributions, and compatibility of interests — an egalitarian reciprocity which may well serve as a model for theory and practice in the whole of the field of educational linguistics.

A problem-oriented discipline

A sampling of feature articles in Penn's Language in Education Division Newsletter of the past several years gives an indication of the practice-based interests and activities of Educational Linguistics faculty and students: a three-day institute on teaching and assessing math offered for teachers and administrators at a bilingual school in Philadelphia's Puerto Rican community (LED News, December 1999); a series of short courses on indigenous and intercultural bilingual education taught in South America (LED News, September 1998); an action research collaborative which studies and supports the implementation of a dual language education program at a Philadelphia middle school (LED News, July 1997); and a five-year teacher enhancement program that seeks to effect broad based and long range improvements in the development of children's science and math literacy skills at the elementary school level (LED News, Spring 1996). Educational linguistics, as practiced at Penn, is not only situated within a school of education, but is also grounded in schools and communities (local and non-local) and geared toward professional practice.

Coursework in the program consistently requires students to be in Philadelphia public or private schools or in adult English language / literacy teaching programs, whether for short-term observation or longer-term research projects, and program faculty maintain ongoing contacts and collaborations with teachers and staff of these institutions. The master's specializations in Intercultural Communication or TESOL (which many Educational Linguistics students complete en route to the doctorate) require internship and service outreach, respectively, as part of the comprehensive examination process. Most of the students enrolled in the doctoral specialization bring with them pressing (or incidental) questions of practice gleaned from their prior or ongoing teaching experience, questions which provide a focus and a prod for inquiry in the classroom and in their studies. Dissertation topics range from ethnographies of bilingual language and literacy practices at home and in school in both immigrant and indigenous language minority communities, to investigations of the acquisition of communicative competence in specific speech acts in ESL, to studies of language and culture learning in language immersion camps or foreign exchange programs, to explorations of the effects of particular tasks or interaction patterns on second language learning, to interpretive studies of the implementation and impact of language policy on language use and language teaching.

Pica notes that educational linguistics research has shed light primarily in two domains of practice: design and implementation of learner-centered,

communicative curricula (LCCC) and professionalization of the classroom teacher as decision-making educator. With respect to the former, Pica points out, educational linguists have identified and recorded language used in the professional, vocational and academic contexts toward which learners aim and they have also built on theories of communicative competence (1994:265). With respect to the teacher as decision-maker, educational linguists have carried out research which teachers can draw on to answer questions such as: (1) "how should a LCCC be organized with respect to classroom content and activities?" (1994:269), (2) "which types of classroom organization are effective in providing a social and linguistic environment for L2 learning?" (1994:274), and (3) "how can a LCCC be adjusted and enhanced when exchange of message meaning is not sufficient for L2 mastery?" (1994:276). Consistent with Spolsky's early formulations which opened the present paper, Pica emphasizes that educational linguistics offers no prescriptions, but rather a source of information that teachers can apply as they make decisions (1994:280). More recently, Brumfit (1997) suggests that there is a need for more research into teachers' (both language teachers' and other teachers') explicit beliefs about, and understandings of, language in order to enable us to understand teachers' central role as educational linguists, that is, as conscious analysts of linguistic processes.

The view from Penn's Educational Linguistics program, as enunciated so clearly by Pica above, is one based in the practice of language learning and teaching. It is a view consistent with Spolsky's suggestion that "a more productive approach is to start with a specific problem and then look to linguistics and other relevant disciplines for their contribution to its solution" (1978:2). The problem areas Pica identifies are curriculum and teacher decision-making, problems also identified by Spolsky (along with materials development) in his description of an educational linguistics approach to the Navajo Reading Study begun in 1969 (1975:349-351; also 1974c).

The Navajo Reading Study was itself an attempt to address an even more fundamental problem - the language barrier to education, i.e. the instance where a child acquires a vernacular language informally and is required by the educational system to acquire a different, standard language (Spolsky 1974b:2029), a problem which recurs for millions of children daily, weekly, and yearly all over the world and is, as Spolsky suggested, a perennial pursuit for educational linguistics. Spolsky's book, Educational Linguistics (1978), is in effect addressed precisely to the range of issues which require attention in order to address the language barrier, as revealed in his chapter titles, ranging from sociolinguistic issues such as multilingualism, language situations and policies, language, society, and education, and speech communities and schools – to psycholinguistic considerations such as the nature of language, acquisition of language, what it means to know a language, and language, the individual, and education.

As with the general consensus on the relevance of linguistics for education mentioned in the preceding section, there is also a general consensus

that educational linguistics must take (language) educational practice (rather than linguistics) as a starting point. Suardiaz and Domínguez begin from the contact between linguistics and a particular (language) educational problematic, that of mother tongue teaching (1987:162). Myers, "in an attempt to define more clearly what the subject of inquiry should be in the field of Educational Linguistics,... invited practitioners and students to voice their concerns around major classroom questions related to language..." (1994:193). Pakir, writing about multilingual Singapore, makes a plea for educational linguists to "worry less about educational and psychological perspectives and look for the larger goal of achieving success in bilingual education for the community" (1994:371), by which she appears to be calling for more attention to educational practice and less to linguistic theory. Even Stubbs, who on the whole begins from linguistics rather than education, introduces a number of the linguistic topics he takes up throughout the book on the basis that they (actually or potentially) present problems to educationalists: e.g. the teaching of vocabulary (1986:112); the model of language underlying the concept of oracy (ability in spoken language) (1986:142); the diagnosis of semantic pragmatic disorder (1986:174); and problematic characteristics of the English writing system (1986:224); and devotes his final chapter to "ways in which linguistic theory should take more account of practice" (1986:246).

In sum, educational linguistics takes as its starting point the practice of (language) education, addressing educational problems and challenges with a holistic approach which integrates theory and practice, research and policy. Stubbs recognizes this when he outlines description, theory, and practice as the three ways in which any linguistic topic of interest to educationalists must be approached (Stubbs 1986:7). Smitherman (1979) enunciated it clearly and early on with respect to formulating an adequate theory of pedagogy for African-American children (many of whom arrive at school speaking a vernacular language different from the standard), calling for a holistic approach to language that would encompass theory and research within a paradigm that allows for the analysis of speech and language systems in their socio-cultural reality, policy and planning that would put the study of black speech in school, address testing issues, and push for national policy affirming all languages and dialects, and implementation and practice that would adopt a theme of pedagogy and knowledge for liberation for the community, establish training in language and culture of blacks for all teachers, and promote recognition that "everybody needs communicative competence" (1979:210).

Scope with depth

Communicative competence, first proposed by Hymes in 1966 (1972) in reaction to Chomsky's (1965) use of the term competence in a much narrower sense, describes the knowledge and ability of individuals for appro-

priate language use in the communicative events in which they find themselves in any particular speech community. This competence is by definition variable within individuals (from event to event), across individuals, and across speech communities, and includes rules of use as well as rules of grammar. Hymes' functional and multiple conception of language ability and use in communicative context gave impetus to the development of not only a whole branch of sociolinguistics (the ethnography of communication) but also a language teaching movement (communicative language teaching), both of which have endured to the present.

The influence of these ideas on Penn's Educational Linguistics program is readily evident, perhaps most noticeably in the inclusive, sociocultural approach to language education practiced in the program, an approach which, among other things, emphasizes the learning and teaching not only of linguistically defined grammatical knowledge (rules of grammar) but also of culturally embedded ways of speaking (rules of use); acknowledges the role of not only the immediate interactional context but also the historical, sociocultural, economic, and policy context surrounding language learning and teaching; recognizes the value of learning and teaching not just one standard language variety, but multiple varieties and patterns of language use; and perhaps most importantly, addresses not just language learning and teaching per se, but also the role of language in the construction and negotiation of both academic knowledge and social identity. Hereinafter, I will signal this last triple emphasis (on language, content, and identity) with the phrase "(the role of) language (in) learning and teaching." [12]

At Hymes' very first meeting with the Faculty of Education in the spring of 1975 (before his actual appointment as dean), he announced his intention to develop two academic emphases under his deanship, namely educational linguistics and the anthropology (or ethnography) of education (Erling Boe, personal communication, 9 September 1998).[13] In the ensuing years, there emerged at GSE "an environment favorable to interests in language and anthropology/ethnography, involving a variety of people, some there only for a while" (Hymes, personal communication, 26 October 1998). We have mentioned above the inauguration of the Educational Linguistics program and the Language in Education Division as a reflection of his emphasis on educational linguistics; similarly, Hymes' goals with respect to the anthropology/ethnography of education were infused into the Edu-

[12] Wodak (1997: xii) makes a similar tripartite emphasis (language as subject of instruction, medium of instruction, and medium of identity construction), describing language as central in the socialisation process and in schools, as follows: "L1 which determines the identity and the intellectual and cognitive development of individuals; [L1] as mode for transfer of knowledge and for interaction between teacher and student; [and L1] as object of knowledge and critical reflection in both L1 and L2 education."

[13] As Associate Dean under Hymes, Professor Boe worked closely with Wolfson in strategizing on the fiscal and administrative dimensions involved in building Educational Linguistics; he also chaired the search committee that recommended the appointment of Wolfson as Assistant Professor of Education at GSE in 1978.

cation, Culture, and Society Division (now a program within the Educational Leadership Division) and the Center for Urban Ethnography which hosts the annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, now going into its 23rd year. In both cases, the one emphasis has informed the other, and, indeed, a sociocultural approach to language and a linguistically-informed understanding of sociocultural context have permeated other parts of the school as well.[14]

In keeping with this inclusive, sociocultural view of language in education, the comprehensive examination in Educational Linguistics identifies six areas of coverage (of which students choose three to be examined on): microsociolinguistics; macrosociolinguistics; language teaching methods and program design/evaluation; language planning and policy / educational policy; language acquisition: first and second; and interdisciplinary perspectives on educational linguistics. Similarly, the *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, sixteen volumes of which have been published under student editorial direction since 1984, solicit papers on topics "ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition" (1997, Vol. 13, No. 2, inside back cover).

This inclusive, sociocultural view of communicative competence and communicative contexts is also reflected in the range of dissertation topics pursued in Penn's program, such as:

1) descriptions of native speaker and / or non-native speaker communicative competence for various speech acts and social networks and identities:

speech acts: Benander 1993 on positive evaluations, Billmyer 1990 on compliments, Boxer 1991 on indirect complaints, D'Amico-Reisner 1985 on disapprovals, Goldschmidt 1993 on favor-asking, Meyer 1996 on disagreements, Rabinowitz 1993 on offers, and Walter-Goldberg 1985 on jury summation.

social networks and identities: Adams 1998 on gesture in foreigner talk, Bender 2000 on the social reality of a dual language program in an urban elementary school, Citron 1996 on study abroad students in Spain, Jakar 1995 on Hebrew language immersion camp, Kabongo-Mianda 1990 on two Zairean children acquiring English, Kubota 1999 on ESL learners' construction and display of social identities in the language learning classroom, Lincoln 2001 on the educational experience of language minority children in a rural Arkansas school district, Morgan 1989 on the language of three generations of black women in

[14] The Education, Culture, and Society (ECS) division / program has been another site for linguistics at GSE, numbering among its faculty over the years such distinguished linguistic anthropologists as Shirley Brice Heath, Bambi Schieffelin, Katherine Woolard, Frederick Erickson and, currently, Stanton Wortham. The infusion of interests in language and ethnography extends beyond the LED and ECS divisions as well, as seen for example in the Psychology in Education Division, in the work of former faculty Michele Fine and Brian Sutton-Smith, as well as current faculty Howard Stevenson, Margaret Spencer, and Daniel Wagner. Wagner directs the Literacy Research Center and its affiliated National Center on Adult Literacy and International Literacy Institute, in which Educational Linguistics and Language in Education faculty and students collaborate heavily.

Chicago, Newman 1993 on language learning in the Russian Jewish immigrant community in Philadelphia, Pomerantz 2001 on Spanish-as-a-foreign-language learners' identity construction through the linguistic resources at their command; and Szpara 2000 on student teachers' talk about difference in an urban high school.

2) investigations of communicative contexts for second language, foreign language, and bilingual learning and teaching in language and content classrooms at elementary, secondary, and adult or higher education levels, including:

interaction and negotiation in second language learning and teaching: Berg 1998 on peer response in adult ESL writing classes, Boyd-Kletzander 2000 on giving ESL learners responsibility for shaping their own learning, Dessner 1991 on teacher feedback in ESL, Doughty 1988 on effect of instruction in acquisition of relativization in ESL, Futaba 1994 on learner interaction in second language learning, Holliday 1995 on native speaker-nonnative speaker negotiations in second language learning of syntax, Linnell 1995 on negotiation as a context for second language learning, Park 2001 on the effects of form and meaning-focused instruction on second language phonological acquisition, Silver 1999 on input, output and negotiation in second language acquisition, Tseng 1992 on peer participation in second language learning, and Wanmansor 1999 on the MOO (multi-object-oriented, synchronous computer communication) as an environment for ESL;

processes and models in second language learning and teaching: Boatman 1989 on perception and production in adult second language learning, Carrier 1999 on second language listening comprehension, Chen 2000 on first language transfer and second language proficiency in Chinese ESL learners' writing, Hwang 1989 on bidirectional transfer and markedness in Korean and English second language learning, Keenan 1993 on a connectionist model of second language acquisition, Kim 1992 on typological and transformational perspectives on ESL learning, Labov 2000 on German ESL learners' production of the short A and E vowel contrast, Nimmrichter 1997 on the role of universal grammar in German second language acquisition, Washburn 1992 with a Vygotskian perspective on fossilization in second language learning, and Young 1989 on variation in interlanguage morphology in Chinese speakers learning ESL;

foreign language learning and teaching: Chen 1997 on corrective feedback in foreign language learning (Chinese), Freire 1989 on teachers' theoretical framework and classroom practice in foreign language teaching (Portuguese), Gayman 2000 on language use and social interaction in a two-way immersion kindergarten classroom (French/English), and Kanagy 1991 on developmental sequences in foreign language learning (Japanese);

content learning and teaching: Berducci 1995 on science mentoring in the elementary school, Kaplan 1992 on the mutual influence of speaking and writing in classroom interaction, Kipers 1993 on the role of gender in teacher interaction, Shah 2000 on the sheltered classroom as a context for second language learning, Sotillo 1991 on facilitating input comprehension in transitional college

courses for ESL students, and Tanner 1991 on questioning as a teaching strategy among international teaching assistants.

The inclusive, sociocultural view of communicative competence and contexts has also been the impetus for the program's research and practice initiatives on bilingualism and biliteracy in Philadelphia's diverse urban schools and communities, as well as in multilingual settings all over the world. The program has had a steady record of involvement since the mid-1980s with the Puerto Rican community in North Philadelphia (e.g. Hornberger 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992; Hornberger and Micheau 1993; Micheau 1990; Rubio 1994; Freeman 1999, 2000; Varghese 2000) and with Asian immigrant and Southeast Asian refugee communities in West and South Philadelphia (e.g. Weinstein-Shr 1986, 1993, 1994 on Hmong literacy; Chen 1992 on language maintenance and shift in the Chinese community; Hardman 1994, Hornberger and Hardman 1994, Hornberger 1996, and Skilton-Sylvester 1997 on language and literacy in the Cambodian community). In the early 1980s while she was an Educational Linguistics student, Gail Weinstein-Shr founded Project LEIF (Learning English through Intergenerational Friendship), an ESL tutoring service with particular outreach to older refugees, and it —and its successor SHINE— have since been staffed and directed by numerous other Educational Linguistics students.[15] These efforts in Philadelphia's diverse urban sphere have flourished under and also furthered overall Graduate School of Education (GSE) priorities, as exemplified in the Center for Urban Ethnography and in the recent Spencer Foundation Research Training Grant with its focus on urban education research.

Educational linguistics faculty have not only carried out research internationally, but have also consulted, lectured and taught in Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Japan, Peru, Singapore, South Africa, and Taiwan. Likewise, educational linguistics students have carried out research on the same wide range of topics noted above, and in many corners of the globe, for example:

Botswana: Language planning and education policy (Nyati-Ramahobo 1991)

Brazil: Peers as resource for language learning in foreign language context (Assis 1995)

Britain: Mainstreaming as language policy and classroom practice (Creese 1997)

[15] Project LEIF (now subsumed under Project SHINE and implemented nationally in five urban sites) has been described by its founder as "a model program developed at Temple University Institute on Aging's Center for Intergenerational Learning [through which] over 1,000 college-age volunteers have been trained to tutor English as a second language (ESL) to elder refugees and immigrants at community centers throughout the city; these include a Cambodian Buddhist temple, a Chinese community center, a Latino senior center, and a multicultural neighborhood center" (Weinstein-Shr 1994:120).

Cyprus: Turkish language reform in a language planning framework (Dogancay 1993)

Ecuador: Language revitalization in the Andes (King 1997)

Eritrea: Ideologies and methodologies in English language instruction (Wright 2001)

Israel: The social world of a preadolescent school class (Spiegel 1999)

Japan: Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations (Iino 1996); honorific use in everyday speech of Japanese women (Okushi 1997)

Kazakhstan: Identity planning and language orientation planning (DeLorme 1999)

Malaysia: Learning ESL: Reinforcing and suppressing factors in two communities (Razali 1992); Acquisition planning for English in tertiary education (Zakaria 1997)

Pakistan: Literacy practices in a rural community (Farah 1992)

Singapore: Production principles in non-native institutionalized varieties of English (Williams 1987)

Yugoslavia: Self-management and classroom interaction (Rosenfeld 1986).

These efforts have provided impetus for and are congruent with recent GSE priorities in international education. GSE's Office of International Programs and its Six Nation Education Research Project (SNERP) were inaugurated in 1993 and the UNESCO-sponsored International Literacy Institute (ILI) opened at GSE in 1994 under the auspices of the Literacy Research Center directed by Daniel Wagner. Educational Linguistics faculty have collaborated in the initiation and continuation of these international efforts and have involved students and alumni in them as well. As part of the SNERP Language Education and Literacy Project, Ph.D. candidates Leslie Harsch and Bruce Evans co-authored a report on the status of language minority education in the US which was published in volume 15 of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* (Hornberger, Harsch, and Evans 1999); and Ph.D. alumni Rita Silver '99 at the National Institute of Education in Singapore and Masakazu Iino '96 at Waseda University in Japan are participating in a six-nation study on pedagogical practices in English language education.

"The scope of the field of educational linguistics," Spolsky wrote, " is defined by the interaction of language and formal instruction" (1975:347), or, in a slightly more elaborated phrase, "the intersection of linguistics and related language sciences with formal and informal education" (1978:2). Like Hymes and Penn's Educational Linguistics programs, Spolsky's concept of educational linguistics begins from the concept of communicative

competence:

> "Educational linguistics starts with the assessment of a child's communicative competence on entering school and throughout his or her career, includes the analysis of societal goals for communicative competence, and embraces the whole range of activities undertaken by an educational system to bring its pupils' linguistic repertoires into closer accord with those expected by society. It thus is concerned with the processes used to bring about change, whether to suppress, enrich, alter the use of, or add, one or more styles, dialects, varieties, or languages" (1978:viii).

He mapped out on various occasions some of the areas encompassed within this scope, including child language acquisition, first (mother tongue) and second (or additional or foreign) language teaching, the teaching of reading/writing/literacy, bilingual education, the teaching of literature, and testing (1974a:2023; 1974b:2034; 1975:347; 1978:175; 1994:88). All of these have remained remarkably consistent topics in the field, as evidenced for example in the 1994 Georgetown University Round Table (Alatis 1994), which included, in addition to most of these, explicit attention to second language acquisition, language minority education, English as a world language, and the study of speech acts and discourse; and in the 1997 *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Corson 1997), whose eight volumes are devoted to language policy and political issues, literacy, oral discourse, second language education, bilingual education, knowledge about language, language testing and assessment, and research methods.

The scope of educational linguistics is, then, remarkably wide, but does not therefore sacrifice depth. Because of the functional and multiple conception of language in use which underlies it, there is constant attention to the possibilities of different meanings, different implications, different choices of language in particular contexts.[16] Hymes himself warned against the pitfall of scope without depth, noting that "simple models of rational actors and participants in discourse, while seeming to clarify experience, actually may obscure and mystify it ... Rational choice, propositional clarity, clear turn taking, and the like are not models from which to predict the movement of participant-particles, but half of a dialectic between conven-

[16] This emphasis on meanings and choice is consistent with a plea issued by Christie (1994) for an educational linguistics which would operate with a model of language in terms of a resource for meaning (following Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics), rather than in terms of 'rules' (1994:122); Penn Educational Linguistics emphases on meanings and choice are also consistent with, indeed as I argue here, informed by both Hymes' notion of communicative competence and Spolsky's concept of educational linguistics, Christie's reservations notwithstanding (1994:100, 106).

tion and choice" (1986:87-88).

Birds on a wire

Such a dialectic is also at play in the interaction among academic disciplines. Since there is no one "conventional" choice for professional affiliation for educational linguists, Penn's Educational Linguistics faculty and students participate in a wide array of professional associations. Faculty and students are members and regular presenters at, for example, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the Linguistic Society of America (LSA), the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (NWAVE), the Second Language Research Forum (SLRF), the Sociolinguistics Symposium, and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), among others. Similarly, they subscribe to, publish in, and serve on the editorial boards of myriad professional journals such as *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Applied Linguistics, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, International Journal of the Sociology of Language, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Language and Education, Language in Society, Language Learning, Language Problems and Language Planning, Language Teaching Research, Linguistics and Education,* and *TESOL Quarterly,* to name only a few of the most frequently consulted. These multiple affiliations provide for constant interchange among the many disciplines which inform the field of educational linguistics, primary among them linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, applied linguistics, anthropology, and education; and they also provide multiple forums in which the voices and concerns of educational linguists are heard.

Van Lier uses the very apt metaphor of birds on a wire to characterize the shifting and repositioning that goes on among academic disciplines when a new one joins their midst; he also observes that "if they refuse to budge, the newcomer will have to fly off again" (1994:203-204). The foregoing sections of this paper suggest, I think, that educational linguistics has indeed found a place on the wire amidst its peer disciplines.[17] In his proposal for the field of educational linguistics, Spolsky had suggested that it would constitute a subfield of applied linguistics, the latter inclusively defined as "the cluster of fields embracing all studies of language

[17] The growing visibility of educational linguistics as a field is illustrated by tenure-track faculty search advertisements posted in the past several years, e.g. one by the University of California at Berkeley for an Assistant Professor in Educational Linguistics, and another by the University of New Mexico for an Assistant Professor in Native American Educational Sociolinguistics, whose responsibilities would include "mentoring of Native American and other students of educational linguistics." Another index is the emergence of electronic listserves using the name educational linguistics, such as edling@education.leeds.ac.uk or the former edlingo@dolphin.upenn.edu.

intended to be directly and immediately relevant to some social, educational, political, literary, or commercial goal" (1974c:553). He also identified two reasons why he preferred the title educational linguistics to applied linguistics: one, that applied linguistics includes some topics that may be outside of educational linguistics, such as "translation, lexicography, language planning"; and two, that the assumption that linguistics can be directly applied to education is problematic (1978:1). Shuy, too, wanted to differentiate educational linguistics from applied linguistics; indeed, he wanted to substitute the former term for the latter, because he felt that applied linguistics had become misunderstood to mean only ESL, the teaching of English as a Second Language (1981:458). Finally, van Lier was concerned that the 1980s had seen the development of a serious rift in the field of applied linguistics, between SLA researchers who distanced themselves from practice and teacher researchers who emphasized a strong pedagogical focus (1994:202).

From today's perspective, none of these concerns seems any longer relevant. A glance at the topic areas for the 2002 AAAL conference reveals a list very similar to, if somewhat more elaborated than, the ones presented earlier for educational linguistics, to wit: language and its acquisition, language and assessment, language and the brain, language and cognition, language and culture, language and ideology, language and instruction, language and interaction, language and listening, language and media, language and policy, language and reading, language and research methodology, language and society, language and speaking, language and technology, language and translation/interpretation, language and writing (to which I might add: language and identity, language and socialization) . It appears that applied linguistics is no longer solely identified with ESL, nor is it split between theory and practice. Neither is it necessarily wider in scope than educational linguistics;[18] even applications of linguistics for social, political, literary, or commercial ends (following Spolsky above) may ultimately relate to education in one way or another. The core differences between applied linguistics and educational linguistics, and they are not negligible ones, are the focus and starting point for the discipline. In educational linguistics, the starting point is always the practice of education and the focus is squarely on (the role of) language (in) learning and teaching. It is on those important differences that the argument for educational linguistics as a separate field rests, and it is in addressing those important challenges that the field of educational linguistics has its work cut out for many years to come.

[18] Van Lier sees educational linguistics as a sub-classification of applied linguistics, in turn a sub-classification of linguistics, while acknowledging that this hierarchical nomenclature may not satisfy all of his colleagues (1997:95)

References

Adams, T. (1998). *Gesture in foreigner talk*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Alatis, J. E. (Ed.). (1994). *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Assis, A. A. (1995). *Peers as a resource for language learning in the foreign language context: Insights from an interaction-based study*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Benander, R. (1993). *Communicative competence in second language acquisition: Noticing and choosing to perform positive evaluation speech acts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Bender, L. A. (2000). *Language planning and language policy: The interpretation and implementation of a dual language program in an urban, public school*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Berducci, D. (1995). *Internalization and structure of science mentoring: An analysis following Vygotsky and Pike*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Berg, C. (1997). *The effects of trained peer response on writing quality, revision strategies, and peer talk about ESL texts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Billmyer, K. (1990). *The effects of formal instruction on the development of sociolinguistic competence: The performance of compliments*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Boatman, D. (1989). *An investigation of adult second language perception and production: Evidence for and against a predictive account*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Boxer, D. (1991). *A descriptive analysis of indirect complaint sequences among speakers of American English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Boyd-Kletzander, R. (2000). *An inquiry into language learning: When ESL students are given responsibility for shaping their own learning*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Brumfit, C. (1997). The teacher as educational linguist. In L. van Lier & D. Corson (Eds.), *Knowledge about Language* (Volume 6 of the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, pp. 163-172). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Carrier, K. A. (1999). *The learner-interlocutor relationship as a factor in second language listening comprehension: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, F. J. (2000). *The roles of first language transfer and second language proficiency in the writing of Chinese learners of English as a second language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, H. H. (1997). *A study of the effect of corrective feedback on foreign language learning: American students learning Chinese classifiers*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, S. (1992). *Language maintenance and shift in the Chinese community of Greater Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Christie, F. (1994). Developing an educational linguistics for English language teaching: A systemic functional linguistic perspective. *Functions of Language*, 1(1), 95-127.

Citron, J. (1996). *The cross-cultural re-entry experiences of short-term study abroad stu-*

dents from the U.S. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Corson, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Creese, A. (1997). *Mainstreaming as language policy and classroom practice: An interpretive study of partner teachers' roles, relationships, and talk in multilingual British secondary schools.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

D'Amico-Reisner, L. (1985). *An ethnolinguistic study of disapproval exchanges.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

DeLorme, S. (1999). *Mother tongue, mother's touch: Kazakhstan government and school construction of identity and language planning.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dessner, L. E. (1991). *English-as-a-second-language college writers' revision responses to teacher written comments.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dogançay, S. (1993). *Turkish language reform in a language planning framework: Its impact on language use of Turkish Cypriot high school students.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dogançay-Aktuna, S. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish language reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 19(3), 221-249.

Doughty, C. (1988). *The effect of instruction on the acquisition of relativization in English as a second language.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Educational Linguistics Handbook 1999-2001. Language in Education Division. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Farah, I. (1992). *Literacy practices in a rural community in Pakistan.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Freeman, D. (1994). Educational linguistics and the knowledge base of language teaching. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 180-196). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Freeman, R. (1999). *Legitimizing Spanish and Spanish speakers in North Philadelphia: A microethnographic analysis in a dual-language classroom.* Unpublished manuscript.

Freeman, R. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 202-229.

Freire, A. (1989). *Communicative competence as the goal of foreign language teaching: Teachers' theoretical framework and classroom practice.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Futaba, T. (1994). *Second language acquisition through negotiation: A case of non-native speakers who share the same first language.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Gayman, S. M. (2000). *Understanding language use and social interaction in a French/English two-way immersion classroom.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Goldschmidt, M. (1993). *For the favor of asking: A sociolinguistic analysis.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hardman, J. (1994). *Language and literacy development in a Cambodian community in Philadelphia.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Holliday, L. (1995). *Native speaker syntactic modifications in native speaker - nonnative speaker negotiation as input data for second language acquisition of syntax.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research, 59*(3), 271-296.

Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record*, 92(2), 212-229.

Hornberger, N. H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. García (Ed.), *Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (pp. 215-234). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishers.

Hornberger, N. H. (1992). Biliteracy contexts, continua, and contrasts: Policy and curriculum for Cambodian and Puerto Rican students in Philadelphia. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(2), 196-211.

Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Mother tongue literacy in the Cambodian community of Philadelphia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 119*, 69-86.

Hornberger, N. H., & Hardman, J. (1994). Literacy as cultural practice and cognitive skill: Biliteracy in a Cambodian adult ESL class and a Puerto Rican GED program. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult Biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 147-169). Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hornberger, N. H., Harsch, L., & Evans B. (with assistance from Melisa Cahnmann) (1999). Language education of language minority students in the United States. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 15*(1), 1-92.

Hornberger, N. H., & Micheau, C. (1993). "Getting far enough to like it": Biliteracy in the middle school. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*(1), 30-53.

Hwang, S. (1989). *Bidirectional transfer and markedness: Acquisition of Korean and English as L2*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hymes, D. H. (1980). *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hymes, D. H. (1986). Discourse: Scope without depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 57*, 49-89.

Iino, M. (1996). *"Excellent foreigner!": Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations: An ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Jakar, V. (1995). *A society contained, a culture maintained: An ethnography of second language acquisition in informal education*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kabongo-Mianda, K. (1991). *Child interlanguage discourse: the role of peer interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kachru, B. B. (1994). The speaking tree: A medium of plural canons. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 6-22). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Kanagy, R. (1991). *Developmental sequences in the acquisition of Japanese as a foreign language: The case of negation*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kaplan, M. (1992). *Writing as listening: The mutual influence of speaking and writing in classroom interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Keenan, T. (1993). *A connectionist model of second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kim, K. (1991). *Relative clause realization, categorization, and acquisition in English as a second language: The case of genitive relative clause*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

King, K. A. (1997). *Language revitalization in the Andes: Quichua instruction, use, and identity in Saraguro, Ecuador*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kipers, P. (1993). *The role of gender in conversation: Some insights from a community of teachers*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kubota, M. (1999). *Choice of performed identities: Negotiating, constructing and displaying identities in an adult ESL classroom for teaching and learning communicative competence*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Labov, J. L. (2000). *The Roles of distinctive and redundant features in the production of the short A and E vowel contrast by L1 German speakers of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

LED News (1993? – 1999). The Language in Education Division Newsletter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Lincoln, F. (2001). *Language minority populations twice neglected: A critical ethnographic study of language education policy and practice in Middle America*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Linnell, J. (1995). *Negotiation as a context for learning syntax in a second language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Meyer, T. W. (1996). *Language and power in disagreements: Analyzing the discourse of male, female, and male/female couples*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Micheau, C. (1990). *Ethnic identity and ethnic maintenance in the Puerto Rican community of Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Morgan, M. (1989). *From down south to up south: The language behavior of three generations of black women residing in Chicago*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Myers, M. J. (1994). Various perspectives on educational linguistics gleaned from a collaborative project on the use of dictionaries. *Language Awareness*, 3(3&4), 193-200.

Newman, J. (1993). *Ethnography, classrooms, and social networks in the Russian Jewish immigrant community of northeast Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Nimmrichter, S. (1997). *The role of universal grammar in second language acquisition: explaining variability of verb placement in L2 German*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (1991). *Language planning and education policy in Botswana*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Okushi, Y. (1997). *Patterns of honorific use in the everyday speech of four Japanese women*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pakir, A. (1994). Educational linguistics: Looking to the East. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 370-383). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Park, J. K. (2001). *The effects of forms and meaning-focused instruction on second language phonological acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pica, T. (1982). *Second language acquisition in different language contexts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pica, T. (1994). The language educator at work in the learner-centered classroom: Communicate, decision-make, and remember to apply the (educational) linguistics. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Lan-*

guages and Linguistics 1994 (pp. 264-288). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T. (1997). Second language teaching and research relationships: a North American view. *Language Teaching Research, 1*(1), 48-72.

Pomerantz, A. (2001). *Beyond the good language learner: Ideology, identity, and investment in classroom foreign language learning*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rabinowitz, J. (1993). *A descriptive study of the offer as a speech behavior in American English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Razali, N. (1992). *Learning ESL in Malaysia: A study of reinforcing and suppressing factors in two communities*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rosenfeld, M. (1986). *Yugoslav self-management and classroom interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rubio, O. (1994). *"Una buena educación" : A study of parental values, beliefs, and aspirations in a dual-language school*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Shah, I. (2000). *The sheltered classroom as a context for second language learning process and outcomes*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Shuy, R. W. (1981). Educational linguistics. *Neuren Sprachen, 80*(5), 455-468.

Silver, R. E. (1999). *Learning conditions and learning outcomes for second language acquisition: Input, output, and negotiation*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Skilton-Sylvester, E. (1997). *Inside, outside, and in-between: Identities, literacies, and educational policies in the lives of Cambodian women and girls in Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Smitherman, G. (1979). Toward educational linguistics for the first world. *College English, 41*(2), 202-211.

Sotillo, S. M. (1991). *Input, interaction, content and language learning in the bridge classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Spiegel, J. (1999). *"It's My Life": Independence, cohesion, and tensions in the social world of an Israeli preadolescent school class*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Spolsky, B. (1974a). Linguistics and education: An overview. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 2021-2026). The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, B. (1974b). Linguistics and the language barrier to education. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 2027-2038). The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, B. (1974c). The Navajo Reading Study: An illustration of the scope and nature of educational linguistics. In J. Qvistgaard (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics: Problems and Solutions* (Vol. 3, pp. 553-565). Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Spolsky, B. (1975). Linguistics in practice: The Navajo Reading Study. *Theory into Practice, 14*(5), 347-352.

Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational Linguistics: An Introduction*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Spolsky, B. (1994). The beginning of language testing as a profession. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 88-101). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. (Ed.). (1993). *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stubbs, M. (1986). *Educational Linguistics*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Suardiaz, D. E., & Domínguez-Colavita, F. (1987). Aportes a la lingüística educacional: La lengua materna en la educación elemental. *Revista Argentina de Lingüística, 3*(2), 161-169.

Szpara, M. Y. D. (2000). *Talk among student teachers in an urban high school: Questioning dimensions of difference*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Tanner, M. W. (1991). *NNSTA-student interaction: An analysis of TAs' questions and students' response in a laboratory setting*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Tseng, S. D. (1992). *Adding a third language: An in-depth analysis of the teacher questioning processes in a Chinese classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

van Lier, L. (1994). Educational linguistics: Field and project. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 197-209). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

van Lier, L. (1997). Apply within, apply without? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 95-105.

Varghese, M. (2000). *Bilingual teachers-in-the-making: Advocates, classroom teachers, and transients*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Walter-Goldberg, B. (1985). *Jury summation as speech genre: An ethnographic study of what it means to those who use it*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Wanmansor, F. (1999). *Interaction on the network: A case of PennMOO among ESL learners*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Washburn, G. (1991). *Fossilization in second language acquisition: A Vygotskian perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1986). *From mountaintops to city streets: An ethnographic investigation of literacy and social process among the Hmong of Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1993). Literacy and social process: A community in transition. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy* (pp. 272-293). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1994). Literacy and second language learners: A family agenda. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult Biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 111-122). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Williams, J. (1987). *Production principles in non-native institutionalized varieties of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Wodak, R. (1997). Introduction. In R. Wodak and D. Corson (Eds.), *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education* (Volume 1 of the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, pp. xi-xiv). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (1984 to present). Volumes 1(1) – 16 (1). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Wright, M. (2001). *Ideologies and methodologies in language and literacy instruction in postcolonial Eritrea*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Young, R. (1989). *Variation in interlanguage morphology: (s) plural marking in the speech of Chinese learners of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zakaria, M. H. (1997). *Acquisition planning for English: A case in Malaysian tertiary education*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). *"Hablamos los dos. We speak both": Growing up bilingual in El Barrio*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dr. Nancy H. Hornberger is Professor of Education and Director of Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. Her research interests are in sociolinguistics, language planning, bilingualism, biliteracy, and educational policy and practice for indigenous and immigrant language minorities in the United States, Latin America, and internationally.

Constructing a Multicultural National Identity: South African Classrooms as Sites of Struggle Between Competing Discourses

Keith Chick

Linguistics Programme
University of Natal
South Africa

This article reports on aspects of an ethnographic study carried out in six newly integrated schools in post-apartheid South Africa. It presents evidence that these schools are sites of struggle between competing discourses that construct, maintain, and change social identities in those communities and the wider society. It suggests that South Africa's former limited bilingual policies and current multilingual language policies together with discourses at the micro-level that are congruent with them serve to construct quite different South African national identities: hegemonic, exclusive, and conflicted on the one hand, and egalitarian and inclusive on the other. Finally it speculates on the outcome of the struggle between the competing discourses effects on the prospects of South Africans being able to negotiate a truly multicultural national identity.

I am honored to have been invited to give this lecture.[1] More important I am grateful for the opportunity it gives me to acknowledge the debt I owe to Nessa Wolfson. She was, in a fairly short period of our acquaintance, a wonderful mentor and friend.

Our acquaintance dates back to her reviewing an article I submitted in the early 1980s to the journal *Language in Society* entitled "The interactional accomplishment of discrimination in South Africa" (Chick 1985). Because she found it of interest, she introduced herself to me at an international conference, and invited me to visit Penn to discuss my research with her colleagues and students. Nessa subsequently visited South Africa where she had been invited to give a featured address on the subject of intercul-

[1] This paper was given as the 10th Annual Nessa Wolfson Colloquium in November 2000.

tural communication. I well recall that address. This is not only because of its excellent quality, but because, shortly after its conclusion, the conference chair interrupted the proceedings to share the dramatic news that the ANC had been unbanned, and that Nelson Mandela's release was imminent.

Nessa and I shared a number of research goals. Amongst the more important of was the better understanding of the relationship between what takes place in the discourse of everyday interactions and the wider social and policy contexts in which these interactions occur. Driven by the hope that our findings would be useful to policy makers and ordinary citizens alike, we sought evidence to support our intuition that what takes place in everyday conversational interactions is more important than was popularly believed or acknowledged in the literature of the social sciences at that time. Our research showed that macro structural phenomena such as government policies powerfully constrain what takes place in the micro contexts of everyday interactions i.e. they constrain the content and form of the discourse and how it unfolds. What I suspect Nessa found of particular interest in my article is my suggestion that such discourse also helps to sustain the structural conditions of the society in question. I suggested in the article that repeated intercultural miscommunication in apartheid South Africa contributed to negative cultural stereotypes. I suggested further that, by providing a justification or rationalization for discrimination, such stereotypes helped sustain the social barriers and power asymmetries that made it difficult in the first place for people in South Africa to learn one another's culturally diverse ways of communicating.

The exploration of how discourses (Discourses) serve to construct, sustain and change institutional and societal structures has remained a strong interest for me in the years since then. This has been stimulated considerably by my first-hand experience of the dramatic socio-political changes accompanying the demise of apartheid South Africa, and the birth and growth of a non-racial democracy there. I found that it is in just such situations of flux and rapid structural change that the role of discourse in constructing, maintaining, and eroding structures becomes easier to observe.

To illustrate, I will report on a study I carried out recently together with Sandra McKay in six newly integrated schools in the Durban metropolitan area of the KwaZulu-Natal province of South Africa. I will focus, in particular, on evidence that these schools are sites of struggle between competing discourses that construct, maintain, and change social identities in those communities and the wider society. I will contrast South Africa's new multilingual/multicultural language policies with the policies they supplanted. I will suggest that such policies, together with discourses at the micro-level (i.e. in schools and classrooms) that are congruent with them, have the potential to construct quite different national identities from those constructed in the past. I will provide details of three of the most pervasive discourses we observed in these schools, and relate these to language-in-education policies and the South African national identities they putatively construct.

The notion of social identity

It will be apparent from this description that by discourse I mean more than what Gee (1996:127) describes as "connected stretches of language that make sense." I have in mind what he, to distinguish it from this other sense of discourse, refers to as Discourse (with upper case D) i.e. ways of using language and other means of expression to construct social identities and social relations of power (of which discourse – lower case d – is only a part).

My view of discourse and its role is strongly influenced by conflict theory. Conflict theory rejects the functionalist view that dominated sociolinguistics until recently. According to functional theory society is typically in a state of equilibrium, though this is occasionally disrupted by conflict. Such a view does not square with my South African experience. Conflict theory, by contrast, views groups as constantly in conflict, with dominant groups seeking to build and maintain their hegemony, and subordinate groups seeking to wrest power from them. While acknowledging that power is often exercised coercively, conflict theory focuses on the ideological exercise of power through discourse: "the manufacture of consent to or at least acquiescence towards" the dominant groups' hegemony (Fairclough 1989:4). Discourse analysts who accept this conflictual view of society argue that the discourse conventions associated with particular institutions embody assumptions about social identities and relations within the institutions and/or the society at large. They explain, further, that dominant groups establish and sustain their hegemony by means of ideological strategies (see Thompson 1990) such as:

> · projecting their discourse conventions and the assumptions implicit in them as commonsensical, natural or appropriate (i.e. naturalising their own discourse); and
>
> · stigmatising the discourse conventions of subordinate groups.

Such exercising of power may or may not be conscious or intentional. As Davies and Harré (1990:44) point out, what is critical in judging whether or not particular discourses are objectionable, is not whether speakers in the past or present intend their speaking to disempower, but whether it can be shown that in the past they had this effect, even if unintended.

Individuals and groups that do not share these assumptions about social identity sometimes contest them by using discourse conventions invested with quite different assumptions about social identities. Accordingly societal institutions are often sites of struggle between competing discourses "a cultural arena where ideological, discursive and social forces collide in

an ever-unfolding drama of dominance and resistance" (Kumaravadivelu 1999: 475).

In terms of this explanation, social identity or "subjectivity" is multiple, a site of struggle, and changes over time (Weedon 1987). Each individual and each group have identities that are diverse, provisional, often overlapping and even contradictory because interlocutors position themselves and one another through their discourse as participants in a wide range of different and not necessarily compatible story lines. In discourses produced at various times and in various places their professional, ethnic, gender, generational, religious, or linguistic identities become more or less salient. As Davies and Harré (1990:46) put it, "the individual emerges through the process of social interaction, not as a relatively fixed end product but as one who is constituted and re-constituted through the various discursive practices in which they participate". They explain, moreover, that, in terms of this conception of social identity, the subject has agency. Though positioned in a particular way within a dominant discourse, a person may not take up this position, and indeed may contest it by developing quite different story lines i.e. using counter discourses that have implicit in them quite different assumptions about social identities.

Contrasting discourses: South Africa's language-in-education policies past and present

In the period 1910-1994 language policy in South Africa was one of a formidable range of strategies both coercive and ideological through which the state maintained the hegemony of whites over blacks. It was informed by the ideology of the European nation state that assumes a natural division of humanity into nations whose unique identity is reflected in the language they speak. Implicit in this ideology is the myth that people live in single communities bounded in space and time and a "view of culture as a static phenomenon practiced uniformly and transmitted without change from generation to generation rather than dynamic and changing adaptations" (Goode and Schneider 1994:67). For the proponents of this ideology language diversity is a basis for conflict; a problem to be solved by promoting monolingualism. For reasons of political expediency the "solution" decided upon in South Africa was not monolingualism but limited bilingualism. Thus the 1910 Union constitution designated the two ex-colonial languages, English and Dutch, as the sole official languages and made no mention of indigenous African languages.

This policy ensured that native speakers of indigenous languages were marginalized. This is because a high level of proficiency in these two ex-colonial languages became a prerequisite for access to positions and services in most societal institutions e.g. higher education, the professions and the civil service. In judicial courts people who could not speak either English or Afrikaans were obliged to rely on the services of often poorly trained

translators.

The language-in-education policy in period 1910-1930 allowed mother tongue instruction in English and Dutch (subsequently Afrikaans) in the elementary school, but since language education policy for Africans was not prescribed, by default the practice that had been established in African education before union, namely English as language of instruction, continued. After 1948 the Nationalist Government, in trying to consolidate Afrikaner hegemony, attempted to diminish the role of English. They did so by introducing mother tongue instruction in elementary schools for indigenous language speakers, and mother-tongue instruction in single-medium schools for English and Afrikaans speakers. Since mother tongue instruction is usually associated with multilingual policies, it is important to note that rather than a break with the ideology of European nation states this policy reflects an extreme version of it. Rather than opening up space for historically marginalized languages, it was a key strategy in the grand apartheid goal of final exclusion of speakers of such languages i.e. their location in separate, linguistic and culturally homogeneous "nation-states" or Bantustans.

Following the suggestion of Hornberger (2000) that language policies can be viewed as discourse, I suggest that together with a range of other pervasive and dominant discourses in that racist society, these policies helped construct a South African national identity as hegemonic, exclusive and conflicted.

By contrast South Africa's new multilingual policy is informed by a quite different assumption namely that language is a basic human right. The constitution requires that all people have the right to use the language of their choice, and that no person is discriminated against on grounds of language. It specifies that nine major indigenous African languages together with English and Afrikaans shall be official languages at national level, and that conditions shall be created for their development and for the promotion of their equal use and enjoyment. Further it calls for respect for and development of "non-official" languages such as Indian and European heritage languages.

The national language-in-education policy [Section 3(4) (m) of the National Education Policy Act (Act 27 of 1996) the National Education Policy Act (Act 27 of 1996)] is consistent with this national language policy. It requires the promotion of multilingualism through using more than one official language as the language of instruction, and the offering of additional languages as subjects. It also identifies additive bilingualism as the "normative approach" i.e. an approach that assumes that learners learn other languages (including dominant languages) most effectively when there is the continued educational use of the learners' first languages and, therefore, gives respect for the cultural assumptions and values implicit in them. The former Minister of Education (Statement 14 July 1997) explained that this policy is integral to the government's strategy of redressing the

discrimination of the past and building a non-racial nation in South Africa i.e. of transforming society and creating a new South African identity. In his words: "Being multilingual should be a defining characteristic of being South African". He explained, further, that it "presupposes a more fluid relationship between languages and culture than is generally understood in the Euro centric model" and "accepts a priori that there is no contradiction in a multicultural society between a core of common cultural traits, beliefs, practices etc., and particular sectional or communal cultures".

Viewing these new policies as discourse I suggest that they, together with other discourses (in a range of societal institutions) that are congruent with them, have the potential to construct a truly multicultural South African identity i.e. one that is dynamic, overlapping, inclusive and egalitarian.

My reason for saying that it has the potential, is that the new policies have not entered a vacuum. In every institution there are presumably a range of discourses, some that are congruent with the new policies, and some with the old. Hornberger (2000) suggests that the ideological struggle is played out not just at the macro-level of policy discussion, but also at the micro-level of school discourses. Indeed she argues (2000:195) that because school discourses allow for the possibility of the construction of a wide range of multiple overlapping identities, it is at the micro level that the greatest hope for the construction of a national intercultural (multicultural) identity lies.

It is with this scenario in mind that I examine in some detail three of the discourses that were most pervasive in our data. Before I do so, though, I need to briefly share some information about the context and nature of the study.

The context and nature of the study

In 1999 we carried out fieldwork in six schools in the Durban metropolitan area of the KwaZulu-Natal province of South Africa using a combination of traditional and critical ethnographic approaches to data collection and analysis. Our general purpose was to investigate the extent to which the schools are promoting the multilingualism and multiculturalism advocated in the official language-in-education policy.

To provide some background, there were basically five racially-segregated schools systems in KwaZulu-Natal under the apartheid system — one for the white communities (of a little over 500,000 people, according to the 1996 census), one for the Indian community (of almost 800,000 people), one for the so-called Coloured (or mixed-race) community (approximately 100,000 people), and two for the African community (approximately 7,000,000 people). The available resources for the white schools far surpassed those of the black community in the townships and rural areas. The Indian and Coloured schools, while better funded than those of the black

townships, still did not match those of the white community. Because of this historical advantage, schools in the former white communities have far better facilities and achieve dramatically better matriculation examination results than former Indian schools, Indian schools better than the Coloured schools, and the latter better than the African schools in township and rural areas. As a consequence, following the establishment of a single educational authority, there has been a major influx of African students into the Indian (and Coloured) schools located near African townships, and of many Indian students and some African students into former white schools. Since we assumed that the new multilingual/multicultural policy would have greatest appeal and best chance of success in schools that have multilingual/multicultural school populations, we focused on former white and Indian schools (2 high schools and one elementary school of each type) that have become dramatically more linguistically and culturally diverse following the desegregation of schools and other changes associated with the demise of apartheid. Incidentally, although the Indian community has experienced rapid language shift from (principally) Gujarati, Hindi, Tamil, Telegu and Urdu to English in the past 140 years, it remains itself culturally diverse. We did not examine African schools since, according to all available reports, their populations have remained relatively homogenous i.e. predominantly Zulu in language and culture. 98% of the approximately seven million Africans in KwaZulu-Natal (6,808,652) are Zulu native speakers according to the 1996 census.

Consistent with a traditional ethnographic approach to data collection and analysis, we used a wide range of data collection methods to collect rich and reasonably comprehensive data. These included written questionnaires to elicit demographic and other contextual information we asked the principals of schools to complete ahead of time. We did this so that the contextual information could inform our analysis of data collected by other methods including observation and audio recordings of English lessons and interviews with principals and teachers. We also collected documents that we suspected might give insights into the ethos of each school such as brochures for parents who might wish to enroll their children, school magazines, and codes of conduct. Our approach was ethnographic in the sense that we tried to get access to naturally occurring behavior by observing a variety of classes at the target schools. We asked principals if we could observe lessons with oral work in classes in which the degree of ethnic diversity matches or exceeds the average for the school as a whole. We also urged teachers not to prepare something special for the occasion.

Consistent with the ethnographic approach to data analysis, we attempted to be data-driven rather than hypothesis-driven, that is, we attempted as far as possible to let hypotheses, theories, and categories emerge from our analysis rather than impose them on the data. However, as Erickson (1986:143) points out, traditional ethnography is not radically inductive. We did, of course, bring preconceptions about what it would be

important to focus on. However, we tried and succeeded in changing the lines of inquiry in response to changes in perception and understanding as our fieldwork progressed. Again consistent with traditional ethnography, we collected and analyzed concurrently, and our interpretations of data collected earlier guided our collection of subsequent data. We formulated questions relating to recurrent patterns of behavior that we felt might be important to understand and attempted to collect further data relevant to these. We also attempted to capture the participants' perspectives: their perceptions and understandings of what they were experiencing and related these constantly to our own, researcher's perspectives.

We departed radically from traditional ethnography in collecting and starting to process our lesson observation and interview data over a short period of time – just two weeks – to coincide with Sandra McKay's visit to South Africa. We also made use of data I collected independently earlier, as well as that collected by one of my graduate students (Khan ms) who was doing field work in two of those schools. Since we did not have more time for fieldwork it is possible that we may have focused too quickly, and, therefore, failed to capture data that might have yielded greater insights and better understandings.

Another aspect in which we departed from traditional ethnography, which we do not consider a limitation, is that, from the outset, we adopted a critical perspective. As May (1997), an advocate of critical ethnography, explains, traditional ethnographers' "concern with describing a social setting 'as it really is' assumes an objective, 'common-sense' reality where none exists. Rather, this 'reality' should be seen for what it is – a social and cultural construction, linked to wider power relations, which privileges some, and disadvantages other participants"(199). As will become evident, the notion that school practices and outcomes are socially constructed to serve the interests of some and at the expense of others strongly influenced both the questions we asked about our data and the interpretations and explanations we arrived at.

The English-only discourse

Given that the National Education Policy Act (Act 27) was promulgated in 1996 we assumed that progress towards multilingualism (or at least bilingualism) in desegregated schools in KwaZulu-Natal would be evident in increasing teaching/learning of Zulu, the L1 of approximately 80% of people in the province (Krige et al. 1994). We also assumed that in classrooms there would be considerable code switching between Zulu and English. We assumed that, since such behaviors are consistent with official policies, their desirability would be explicitly addressed or, at least, implicitly recognized in the discourses of administrators and teachers. In other words we assumed that what I term multicultural discourses would be pervasive if not yet dominant, and would provide a vehicle for teachers,

administrators and learners to negotiate a more inclusive South African identity. Yet this is not what we found.

While multicultural discourses were evident in our data, we found that overwhelmingly participants were having to negotiate their identities within an English-only discourse. We used this term to suggest that it is very similar to discourse whose ideology and functions in other contexts have been extensively discussed (Auerbach 1993). Referring to the prevalence of English-only discourse in the USA, Auerbach (1993) contends that the English-only discourse is an example of covert ideological control since though "it has come to be justified in pedagogical terms ... it rests on unexamined assumptions, originates in the political agenda of the dominant group, and serves to reinforce existing relations of power"(12).

English-only discourse was particularly evident in our interviews with principals. With the exception of the principal of the former Indian elementary school, all principals explicitly rejected the use of Zulu in the classes other than in Zulu lessons. They also all indicated that code switching from English to Zulu is not permitted except in the playground or where, as some put it, the learners are "deficient" in English. They offered a range of reasons for their position. The principal of one former Indian high school contended that the promotion of English is consistent with the practices of the major political party of South Africa, the African National Congress (ANC),[2] of using English as a means of reconciling rival ethnic groups. This is at odds with the publicly stated position of the ANC. He contrasted his notion of ANC policy with the policy of the other major political party in the region, the Inkatha Freedom Party. He contended that Inkatha promotes the use of Zulu as a symbol of ethnicity, thus creating division within the region. This argument, of course, echoes those offered by the proponents of monolingualism in European nation states. We learnt in the interviews that English-only discourse occurs in a range of contexts of situation including those that are marked for institutional authority. For example, a principal of a former white high school told us that she informs the students and teachers at a school assembly at the beginning of the year that they must use only English in class. She argued that this policy is not discriminatory as it applies not just to Zulu but also to all the first languages of learners at the school. She apparently does not believe that, as the first language of 80% of the population of the province, Zulu should enjoy some priority. She explained that a further reason for prohibiting the use of Zulu

[2] The African National Congress (ANC) has been the governing party at national level since the advent of democracy in 1994. As such it is the chief architect of both the national language and language-in-education policies. In KwaZulu Natal province the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) enjoy more or less equal electoral support, the IFP winning both the 1994 and 1999 elections by very narrow margins. Though the IFP has served and continues to serve in a government of national unity at national level, and though the ANC joined a provincial government of unity in 1999, there has been and continues to be fierce rivalry between the two parties. This has frequently spilt over into criminal acts of violence.

is that occasionally Zulu-speaking learners use Zulu to insult adults and other learners. The principal of a former white elementary school gave another reason. He actively discouraged students from, as he put it, "reverting" to the use of Zulu because they need English for economic advancement.

The undisputed status of the ideological assumptions implicit in English-only discourse is evident in the low levels of provision for the teaching of Zulu in the six schools we visited. Zulu instruction is provided most fully at the former Indian elementary school where Zulu is taught as a subject in all grades. However, learners here are taught by teachers whose own preparation does not extend beyond twelve one-hour Zulu lessons. At one former white high school, Zulu is taught as a subject and is compulsory in grades eight and nine and is an option in grades ten to twelve. At the other former white school, Zulu is offered as an option from grades eight to twelve. However Zulu instruction is offered at neither of the former Indian high schools.

In sum, examination of data drawn from our discussions with school principals revealed that, despite multilingualism being official policy, English-only discourse is pervasive and enjoys institutional support at local level. English is represented as a unifying force; as a vehicle for economic advancement; and as the appropriate choice in prestigious domains such as the classroom. By contrast Zulu is represented as a potentially divisive force and as appropriate only for non-prestigious domains i.e. as more of a handicap than a resource. Learners who choose to use Zulu in class are represented as either rebellious or as deficient in English.

English-only discourse was very evident in our interviews with teachers as well. One of the teachers at a former Indian high school shared that she instructs her students not to use Zulu in class and that she will not let them explain things to one another in Zulu. She believes that if learners are to improve their English and be able to produce critical analyses in English, they must use English in class. In the words of another teacher "if Zulu speakers have chosen an English medium school staffed by native English speakers they must accept that Zulu will not be used in class." Some teachers also noted that the use of Zulu can be used a symbol of rebellion by Zulu speakers and that its use in the classroom can be threatening to teachers and to other non-Zulu speakers.

However, there was evidence in these interviews of a counter-discourse; a multicultural discourse that is congruent with the new national language policies. A number of teachers, primarily younger teachers, stated that they have discovered that the judicious use of Zulu in classrooms can be beneficial and are permitting the use of Zulu even when it runs counter to school policy. Thus, for example, the head of the English department at one former white high school and one of the teachers at a former white elementary school said that they encouraged the use of Zulu in group work.

In general, it seems clear that the teachers and administrators at the

schools we visited are promoting extensive and, at times, exclusive use of English through English-only discourse. Viewed as an ideological strategy, such discourse **naturalizes** the use of English in prestigious domains. Thereby the school's personnel help maintain the hegemony of English in education and society generally. In terms of the assumptions implicit in this discourse, code switching is appropriate only in non-prestigious domains such as the playground or when learners are viewed as deficient in English. English-only discourse also constructs an identity for non-native speakers of English as language-deficient or rebellious and for the Zulu language as having low social and economic value. In other words, it **stigmatizes** Zulu and code switching between English and Zulu. By such strategic means English-only discourse helps maintain the existing power relationships, providing native speakers of English with a distinct advantage in the educational realm. Of more significance to the theme of this paper, this discourse reinforces the notion of South Africa's national identity as exclusive, hegemonic and conflicted.

The decline of standards discourse

A second discourse that was very pervasive was what we termed a decline of standards discourse. In this discourse administrators and teachers emphasized the need for maintaining the so-called canons, for upholding excellence, and for teaching good behavior or manners. A recurrent theme in the interviews was that standards of excellence in schools are being compromised during the process of desegregation. Many teachers and administrators argued that a major challenge facing schools is that critical thinking, moral values, and good manners have to be explicitly taught because schools can no longer rely on learners having been socialized into these in their families and communities. According to many teachers and principals these goals could be attained through the English curriculum. They explained that they often based their selection of topics and literary texts on their relative potential for promoting standards of excellence.

While a number of teachers stated that they valued English literature produced by African writers as a way of recognizing the multiculturalism of the school, some expressed concern that this might compromise the standards of excellence represented by the traditional canons of English literature. For example, one English teacher, who had been teaching at one of the former Indian high schools for fourteen years, said that integration had been a shock, and that although teachers want to treat all students equally, they found it difficult to teach typical curriculum materials like Shakespeare to students who do not speak English well.

Despite the pervasiveness of decline in standards discourse there was evidence in our data of a counter-discourse congruent with the new language policies. For example the head of the English department at one of the former white high schools had chosen *Nervous Conditions* by the Afri-

can writer Tsitsi Dangarembga for the important matriculation examination rather than Hardy's *Mayor of Casterbridge*. She stated that she did not see this choice as a lowering of standards. As she put it, standards relate not to the choice of novel, but to the level at which you choose to teach it.

Moreover, although the discourse of learners was not the focus of our study, we found an interesting example of a learner using discourse to construct a wider, multicultural identity for herself. It occurred in a lesson of a young teacher in a former white high school. She was using a poem, the "Mantis" by Ruth Miller, one of the first published South African women poets. She pointed out that in the Zulu tradition there are many myths surrounding the mantis and called on one girl, presumably a Zulu speaker, to provide information on these myths. By supplying the information this student apparently accepted the teacher's positioning of her as someone with an intimate knowledge of traditional Zulu beliefs. However, I suggest that by describing what "they" believe she negotiated overlapping identities for herself i.e. not just a Zulu ethnic identity but identities in terms of other social categories – perhaps urban, educated, middle class. This was but one of a number of instances in our data that demonstrate that subjects have agency and that social identities are often co-constructed or negotiated.

The decline of standards discourse was evident also in the emphasis placed on the teaching of manners and the ways teachers subvert the goals of newly-introduced Outcomes-based materials. For example, in one grade 1 class the focus was on healthy foods. The teacher began the lesson by asking students why they should eat what she termed "good" food. Then she had students report what they had in their lunch boxes for that day. After advocating what she termed "good" foods such as vegetables and fruit, she suggested that "Some of you may not like what Mummy put in your lunch today," and asked them to draw what they wanted instead. It is significant to note that there was no reference to the ethnic foods of African and Indian students. She also informed us that she has added a unit on table manners to those prescribed because, as she put it, students are not getting such instruction at home.

Our data suggests that these teachers are not alone in their misinterpretation of the purpose of Life Skill units in the curriculum of the elementary schools. One finds a similar emphasis in some of the new Outcomes-based texts. For example, in Life Skills 1 (Lazenby et al 1998) there is a unit on "My School Family" in which there is a focus on rules. The activity begins with the teacher telling the students a story about a boy who always did exactly as he liked. He said, "Rules are for others, but not for me." One day he found he had no friends. Then the teacher is required to ask the children why they think he did not have friends and what they think the boy should have done. The activity ends by having the children draw up a list of rules they think they should have at school such as showing respect, being punctual, and being polite. The participation of the students in this final activity

allows for a diversity of responses. However, nowhere in the materials do the authors alert readers to the possibility of considerable cultural diversity in what counts as respectful, punctual and polite. Nowhere do they alert them to the possibility of culturally diverse ways of expressing respect and politeness. It seems that in an era when the school personnel in general seem to think that standards are declining, the authors are using these materials for inculcating particular middle-class values. It is also important to note that even though the books were designed at a time when multicultural classrooms were increasing, the books give little attention to linguistic or cultural diversity. There is considerable irony in this since curriculum reform in terms of the outcomes-based model is intended by the ANC government as a major instrument for eliminating the inadequacies of education provided during the apartheid era.

To sum up, our findings suggest that the pervasive decline of standards discourse positions the canons and middle-class norms and ways of expressing these as markers of excellence, and other behaviors as threats to excellence. In other words, like English-only discourse, it serves both **naturalizing** and **stigmatizing** functions. By such means it helps maintain existing power relations providing those with an acquaintance with the cultural experience reflected in the canons and middle class norms with an advantage in the educational realm. Of more significance to the theme of the paper, it not only reduces the "space" for the expression, appreciation and development of cultural and linguistic diversity. It also reduces the opportunities for learners to co-construct a truly multicultural identity: one that is multiple, overlapping and changing; one in which, at different times and different places, different social categories (class, gender, generation, residence, recreational interests, religion) are salient.

One-at-a-time discourse

A final discourse that we observed as positioning students in the newly integrated schools of the Durban area is what we term one-at-a-time discourse. Lemke (1990) provides a clear account of one-at-a-time discourse and of the consequence of its widespread use in USA classrooms. Two interactional structures associated with one-at-a-time discourse that he examines in depth, and that occur with high frequency in our data, are teacher exposition and triadic dialogue. He explains that triadic dialogue has the familiar structure of three moves: the teacher initiates, learners respond, and the teacher evaluates their responses. Lemke argues that this involves a transposition of monologue (teacher exposition) into the mere appearance of true dialogue. When these two structures are frequently chosen classroom discourse takes on a one-at-a-time quality i.e. either the teacher or one of the students speaks at any one time, the teacher does most of the talking, and all student talk is channeled through the teacher.

Lemke (1990) acknowledges that teacher exposition and triadic dialogue

(provided that the learners provide thematically correct answers) have some merit. They allow for the explicit teaching of the semantic relationships and thematic patterns of the academic content of the lesson. However, he argues that they do not provide the practice in speaking that learners require if they are to become fluent in the specialist language of the discipline. He argues, further, that triadic dialogues serve the interests of the teachers more than the learners. By choosing these structures teachers ensure that the discourse develops along predictable lines. This means that teachers are not asked unexpected questions and, therefore, are not faced with the challenge of relating the concepts to the common sense understandings of their learners.

Lemke explains that the failure of teachers to engage sufficiently with the learners' understandings is particularly disadvantageous to learners whose backgrounds are different from their own. In other words the use of one-at-a-time discourse has an ideological or gatekeeping function. It limits the numbers of people from historically marginalized groups who succeed in learning and getting access to further education and the careers that require this.

Elaborating further on the ideological function of one-at-a-time discourse, Lemke notes that learners are required to bid for turns, negatively sanctioned for calling-out, urged to wait until nominated, and discouraged from participating in side-talk with other learners (even though it often helps learners to relate their common-sense understandings to those of the teacher). Lemke argues that teachers and administrators police the conventions of one-at-a-time discourse in order to sustain the myth that learning is essentially an individual matter. This allows them to blame individuals for school failure rather than all the participants in the teaching/learning process: learners, teachers, schools, education authorities, and parents. He adds that such policing advantages learners whose family and social background have prepared them for one-at-a-time discourse, and whose home cultures emphasize individual action without the support of others over collective or group activity.

Examination of our field notes revealed that although desks were clustered to allow for group work in as many as twelve of the seventeen classrooms we visited, group work occurred in only 6 lessons. Most teachers, moreover, spent a considerable part of class time socializing students to the one-at-time "rule".

For example in the former white elementary school we observed group work in one classroom only. Remarkably, since the size of classes is often given as a reason for not engaging in-group work, there are 37 learners in this grade two class. The teacher introduced the group task of determining where capital letters are required in a text as a detective game. She indicated that there were eight places in the text where capitals were required, and that the task was to determine where. She appointed a scribe and leader for each group and indicated where each group should work. It was evi-

dent from the purposeful way in which the groups set about their task, that they were familiar with this way of proceeding. However the fact that she felt the need at the end of lesson to apologise to us for the noisiness of the class suggests that the choice of such discourse is marked or unconventional in this school.

This conclusion that one-at-time discourse is unmarked in this school is supported by the considerable time devoted in many of the other lessons we observed to instruction in the conventions of one-at-a-time discourse. For example, one of the teachers who had 30 grade one learners sitting on a carpet in front of her, spelt out explicitly both that one-at-a-time discourse is appropriate in class, and how this should be accomplished. For example, she informed them that they had to wait to be nominated before taking at turn:

T: Now ..if I ask you a question. If I call out YOUR (stressed) name say I say Subkay. Who's got to answer the question?
Ss: Subkay
T: Is Tholani allowed to answer?
Ss: No
T: Is Gugu allowed to answer?
Ss: No
T: Is Ms. Jones (the teacher's aide) allowed to answer?
Ss: No
T: No. So if I call out your name everyone else is zipping it up because you've got to give that person a chance. Even if you KNOW that answer and it's on the tip of your tongue we're going to give that person a chance

She also negatively sanctioned side-talk:

T: We have to listen because it's Debbie's turn. (at reading)

She **stigmatized** simultaneous talk by representing it as what immature people who are not ready for school do:

T: No, no Judith. No, no Judith. Judith. No. We're all doing this. (Putting her finger on her lips.). No no. Judith. Do this. I don't like to do this. I've not done this for a long time. You know that? Because you know who does this? Babies. Babies sit like this. When you were in pre-school didn't you have to sit just like this? No, no, no we can't talk if thirty or forty children are all talking at the same time....TALK ONE AT A TIME (slowly)

There was evidence, however, of a counter discourse in the former Indian elementary school. One of the few teachers who made use of group work explained that she started doing more group work since attending an Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) in-service workshop. She added that it is school policy to arrange learner's desks in clusters to facilitate group teaching consistent with OBE. She explained that what she sees as an advantage of group work is that quick progress can be made because the brighter and more fluent learners can explain to others exactly what is re-

quired. She feels that group work succeeds when there is something to construct or when the learners have relevant knowledge. She added that when dealing with a new section of work she resorts to teacher-fronted teaching.

To sum up, there was clear evidence in our data that one-at-a-time discourse is pervasive in these schools and enjoys considerable institutional support. Such discourse constructs social identities for students familiar with it (mostly white and Indian middle-class) as competent, and for students who are not (mostly black African), as incompetent and, possibly, rebellious. As such, like English-only and decline-of-standards discourse, it helps maintain existing power relations. There was also evidence that the implementation of the new curriculum (OBE) is creating space for counter discourses in and through which the non-traditional intake of students can position themselves, their languages and cultural assumptions in a more positive way. However, in turn, this contesting is apparently being countered by the vigorous attempts to socialize such learners to dominant discourses and to police departures from it. We speculate that increasing cultural diversity in classrooms has made teachers feel an even greater need to engage in one-at-a-time discourse than they did before desegregation.

Of more significance to the theme of the paper, our findings suggest that one-at-time discourse severely restricts the opportunities for many learners to explore their own cultural experiences and meanings. As such it further reduces the opportunities of learners to negotiate a truly multicultural identity.

Conclusion

In general this study suggests that the schools we visited are sites of struggle between discourses that are congruent on the one hand with the discriminatory language policies of the past, and those that, on the other hand, are congruent with the current enlightened polices. It reveals that English-only, decline of standards, and one-at-a-time discourses are very dominant and serve ideological purposes. They, for example, marginalize students who do not speak English as a first language and who do not share middle-class values and middle-class ways of expressing them. They tend to construct an identity for them as language deficient and/or rebellious and/or unmannerly. As such they reinforce the view of South African national identity as hegemonic, exclusive and conflicted that has been constructed by the discriminatory policies of the past. The study also reveals that there are counter-discourses congruent with the discourse of South Africa's multilingual language policies. Such discourses, I have argued, provide opportunities for the participants to co-construct a truly multicultural South African identity, one that is multiple, dynamic and often overlapping.

In closing I turn to the significance of this study. It could be argued that

since the study was of just six schools in one area of one province of South Africa, it has little significance beyond the schools themselves. Indeed, it could be argued that since English speaking whites and Indians together constitute only about 7% of the total population of 40 million people, what happens in schools that formerly catered for these groups exclusively would have little national significance even if it were possible to claim that the findings can be generalized to other such schools. While generalisation is clearly not possible I believe that there are reasons for arguing that the significance is greater than mere numbers would suggest. The most important of these reasons is that such schools are widely regarded as models for schools from other traditions to emulate. It follows that at very least the study should help people to question what is and is not worth emulating.

Rather than address that question I have chosen to speculate about answers to the more difficult question about what one can conclude from the study about the prospects of South Africans being able to construct a truly multicultural national identity.

As Pennycook (1999:335) observes, "critical analyses of social structure and the ways in which social relations may be culturally or ideologically maintained often tend to be pessimistic, deterministic, and reproductive, that is to say, they tend to suggest that people are trapped in unequal relations of power". And I acknowledge that it is easy in South Africa, now that the honeymoon period of South Africa's new democracy has passed, to interpret this study as further evidence that more things change, the more they remain the same. However there are a number of positive features that I wish to highlight.

The first is the space that South Africa's new language policies have opened up for the counter discourses that, though currently rather subdued, are evident in these schools. It is so much easier for one to contest the historical dominant discourses in these schools when the ideological assumptions implicit in ones counter discourse are congruent with those official policies. I also glean hope from the attitudes of the participants in these schools. It is possible that in exploring the ideological function of pervasive discourses in these schools what I have depicted is the desperate clinging to power at the micro level of a racist minority that at the macro level has lost most of its political power. Many of the assumptions implicit in these discourses are indeed racist, which should not surprise anyone since they became dominant in the apartheid era. However it may be that their pervasive use by teachers and administrators in these schools is related less to commitment to these assumptions and more to limited exposure to other discourses. What Sandra McKay and I were impressed by was the openness and trust shown by the teachers and administrators in giving us access to their classrooms and in sharing their perceptions with us. We were also impressed by their commitment to desegregated schooling and to the goal of quality education.

If I am correct in my assessment of the prospects for change then what I

see as urgently required is for those in education to engage with multicultural discourses. It is here that I believe that politicians and academics have a particularly important role to play. One of the things that opened up space for multicultural discourse was the inclusivity that Nelson Mandela so often showed in his public utterances while President. Equally important I believe are empirical studies that have the potential to contest the assumptions implicit in dominant discourses. To be more specific I see an urgent need for studies of the sociolinguistic repertoires of speakers of indigenous language in South Africa along the lines of Zentella's (1997) study of code-switching amongst Puerto Rican children in New York or Rampton's (1995) study of "crossing" amongst adolescents of Anglo, Afro-Caribbean and Indian descent in Britain. Since such studies would highlight the remarkable bilingual and multidialectal competencies of many indigenous speakers, they would inevitably contest the assumptions about the language deficiencies of indigenous speakers implicit in the dominant discourses examined in this study.

This observation about the research needed, allows me to make a connection with where I began this address. You will recall that I said that the hope Nessa and I shared was that our research would be useful to policy makers and ordinary citizens alike. It is my hope that this will be true of the study that I have reported on in this address today.

References

Auerbach, E. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32.

Chick, J.K. (1985). The interactional accomplishment of discrimination in South Africa. *Language in Society, 14*(3), 299-326.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social behavior., 20*(1), 43-63.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies*. London: The Falmer Press.

Goode, J. & Schneider, J. (1994). *Reshaping ethnic and racial relations in Philadelphia: Immigrants in a divided city*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hornberger, N. (2000). Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 31*(2), 173-201.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. Special-Topic Issue: Critical Approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453-484.

Khan, Y. (ms.) Multilingualism in education: A case study of two schools. Research in progress.

Krige, D., Dove, S., Makalima, B. & Scott, D. (1994). *The Education Atlas of South Africa*. Durban: EGIS Unit of The Education Foundation.

Lazenby, B., Nmakola, N. & Molopo, R. (1998). *Life Skills 1*. Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.

Lemke, J. (1990). *Talking science: language, learning and values*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

May, S. (1997). Critical ethnography. In N. Hornberger & C. Corson (Eds.)

Enclycopedia of Language and Education. Vol. 8: Research Methods in Language and Education (pp. 197-206). The Netherlands: Kluver Academic Publishers.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction. Special-Topic Issue: Critical Approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 329-348.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New York: Longman.

Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture: critical social theory in an era of mass communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Towards a National Language Plan for South Africa: Final Report of the Language Plan Task Group (LANTAG) Presented to the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, Dr. B. S. Ngubane, August 8, 1996.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Acknowledgements

Research for this paper was supported by grants from the Centre for Scientific Development and the University of Natal Research Fund. I also wish to thank Ralph Adendorff for his helpful comments on earlier versions. Most important I acknowledge the major contribution of Sandy McKay. The research on which paper is based was truly collaborative, so much so that it is difficult to separate out our individual contributions. This is why, as careful readers will have noted, I had such difficulty with choice of pronouns.

J. Keith Chick is Emeritus Professor in the Programme in Linguistics at the University of Natal, South Africa. He holds an M.A. in applied linguistics from Lancaster University (U.K.) and a Ph.D in sociolinguistics from the University of Natal. His specialist interests include interactional sociolinguistics, intercultural communication, language-in-education policy and planning, critical discourse analysis, and applied linguistics and language teaching. His writing in these areas has been published in edited volumes and in South African and international journals, including Language in Society and the Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.

Ventriloquating Shakespeare: Ethical Positioning in Classroom Literature Discussions

Stanton Wortham

University of Pennsylvania

This article describes how political and ethical positioning in classroom discussions can be intertwined with productive conversations about the subject matter. Discussions of compelling literature can involve a tight linkage between the subject matter discussed and the ethical positions taken by students and teachers as they engage in productive classroom discussion. At the same time as they discuss literature in deliberate, rational, pedagogically productive ways, teachers and students also often adopt their own positions on political and ethical issues raised by the literature. This positioning is a form of action: it is not necessarily planned and sometimes not even conscious. This article illustrates such positioning, and shows how it can be interconnected with the subject matter, by analyzing one ninth grade English classroom discussion in an urban US high school.

Colleoni High is a large three-story brick building that occupies an entire city block. Although the custodians work diligently – so that the tile floors often shine and the bathrooms are clean – the physical plant is deteriorating. Paint peels off the ceilings in most hallways and classrooms, and the building feels old. When it was built about 50 years ago, Colleoni High enrolled primarily Catholic children from Irish and Italian backgrounds. Now the neighborhood has become predominantly African American, together with smaller but growing populations of Latino and South Asian immigrants.

Mrs. Bailey's 9th grade English class includes fifteen students: four boys and eleven girls; one Asian, three white and eleven black students. These students are part of a special program, one based on Mortimer Adler's *Paideia Proposal* (1983), in which students are encouraged to discuss "genuine questions." That is, "seminar" discussions like the one analyzed here involve students presenting and defending positions on complex questions, not simply parroting back the teacher's preferred answers. Mrs. Bailey is a veteran English teacher known in the school both for her academic standards and for being sympathetic to students' legitimate concerns. Her classroom has high ceilings and a row of windows along the far wall. The desks are arranged in a circle in the center of the room, with the teacher seated in

a desk just like the students. Although the room is old, Mrs. Bailey has covered most of the walls with various materials-posters encouraging students to work hard because of the rewards of a diploma, information about grammar and other aspects of the curriculum, and a "dialect wall." The curriculum includes literature from various cultural traditions, especially African and African American. When a word in African American Vernacular English or some other dialect appears in a reading, Mrs. Bailey asks students to define the word and she puts the definition on the dialect wall. It contains definitions like "to dis" = "to disrespect someone" and "your grill's busted" = "you're ugly."

The assigned text for this particular class discussion is Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, in particular Antony's speech to the Romans. At this point in the play, Brutus, Cassisus and the other conspirators have killed Caesar and are addressing the Romans who have gathered to hear about Caesar's demise. Antony has remained loyal to Caesar, and he is thus distrusted by Cassius and several other conspirators. But Brutus allows Antony to speak to the gathered Romans, on the condition that he focus on Caesar and say only good things about the conspirators themselves. In his speech Antony skillfully vilifies the conspirators, without explicitly condemning them.

Mrs. Bailey helps the students explore several aspects of Antony's speech. She asks why Brutus would let Antony speak, when several other conspirators opposed this. She asks why Antony incites the Romans to violence as he does. And she asks why many Roman plebeians take Antony's side. These are questions about this particular play, and students do seem to understand the play better at the end of the discussion than they do at the beginning. But these questions also raise political and ethical issues of continuing relevance. Like the rest of us, Mrs. Bailey and her students face questions about how to interpret politicians' claims and actions. Do politicians often act on principle, or are their actions usually scheming and self-interested? The teacher and the students also themselves face questions about the relations between different social classes. Do ordinary, working-class citizens deserve their subordinate status, or is society unjustly organized?

Because compelling literature raises political and ethical questions that contemporary readers continue to face, classroom discussions of such literature can engage teachers and students in struggles over their own beliefs and identities. I argue that the subject matter content of classroom literature discussions – the characterization, themes, and other topics that form the official curriculum – often gets intertwined with political and ethical positioning (Davies & Harré 1990) that teachers and students also do in discussions of literature. At the same time as they discuss Brutus, Antony and the Roman citizens, for instance, we will see that Mrs. Bailey and her students *themselves* adopt political and ethical positions on issues raised by the play. Following and extending Bakhtin (1935/1981), I argue that positioning is common in discussions of literature. Teachers and students often

adopt political and ethical positions with respect to recognized groups and issues from the larger society, as they discuss literature that presupposes those groups and raises those issues. Sometimes individuals provisionally adopt positions in a particular discussion, then discard them. But sometimes positioning in classroom literature discussions can reveal or partly create more enduring identities for individual teachers or students.

This article describes how political and ethical positioning in classroom discussions can be intertwined with productive conversations about the subject matter. Following others, I argue that classroom discourse is multifunctional – speakers simultaneously describe the subject matter and also use speech to position themselves with respect to others and with respect to salient political and ethical issues (Cazden 1988; Halliday 1978; Hymes 1996; Luke 1995). But I also show how discussions of compelling literature can involve a tight linkage between the subject matter discussed and the ethical positions taken. By means of this linkage, teacher and students can implicitly communicate about social class and other issues salient in their own lives. In other words, at the same time as they discuss literature in deliberate, rational, pedagogically productive ways, teachers and students also often adopt their own positions on political and ethnical issues raised by the literature. This positioning is a form of action: it is not necessarily planned and sometimes not even conscious. But systematic analysis of how people speak can uncover evidence of positioning even when it is not conscious for the participants (Wortham 1994, 2001a).

My analysis of positioning in literature discussions follows the turn in literacy studies toward a more sociocultural and historical perspective (e.g., Dyson & Freedman 1991; Schultz & Fecho 2000). Many literacy scholars have found the Russian literacy critic Mikhail Bakhtin particularly useful for examining how sociohistorical context influences students' developing literacies and their engagement with literature (Cazden 1996; Schuster 1997). Bakhtin (1935/1981) describes how all speakers must articulate their own voices by "renting" the words and ideological positions of others. Literacy scholars have analyzed how, as students develop literacy, they rent others' words and then themselves adopt positions with respect to the types of people whose words they are renting – thus entering "dialogue" with others' voices (Hicks 1996; Lensmire 1994).

I follow this sociocultural approach to literacy, exploring how teachers and students borrow ethical positions from the larger social world and adopt these positions through classroom discussion of literature. I use Bakhtin's central concept of "voice" and "ventriloquation" in order to analyze how teachers and students adopt political and ethical positions through their discussions of literature. My approach goes beyond previous work on Bakhtin and literacy by showing the complex and inevitable interconnections between subject matter content and positioning, and by illustrating a systematic empirical approach to classroom discourse that can uncover such positioning (Wortham 1994, 1996).

Brutus

Bakhtin begins his definition of "voice" by observing the "internal stratification" of language.

> Language has been completely taken over, shot through with intentions and accents.... All words have the "taste" of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a party, a particular work, a particular person, a generation, an age group, the day and hour. Each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life (1935/1981:293).

The social world is composed of many, overlapping social groups – religious groups, family groups, ethnic groups, and so on. These groups can be defined by social position and by ideological commitments. "Certain features of language take on the specific flavor" of particular groups (Bakhtin 1935/1981:289). Y'all, for instance, would normally be used by speakers from the American South – but not by Southerners trying to avoid sounding Southern. Speakers inevitably use words that have been used by others, words that "taste of" or "echo with" the social locations and ideological commitments carried by those earlier uses (Bakhtin 1953/1986:88). Speaking with a certain voice means using words that presuppose some social position because these words are characteristically used by members of a certain group. A voice is a social position from the stratified world, as presupposed by stratified language.

As Mrs. Bailey and her students begin discussing Julius Caesar, the students presuppose a relatively positive voice for Brutus – as an honorable person who views others charitably. In the following segment Mrs. Bailey asks why Brutus allows Antony to address the Romans. (In these transcripts, "T/B" refers to Mrs. Bailey. All the other speakers are students-for instance, "GER" is Germaine, "TYI" is Tyisha, "CAS" is Cassandra, etc. Transcription conventions are in the appendix).

118	T/B:	why bother- you just knocked the man off. You killed him because he was bad for Rome.
119		Why are you giving Antony an opportunity to say good things about Caesar. (4.0)
120	GER:	well because they say he [was
121	T/B:	[Germaine speak up
122	GER:	he wasn't a bad person but he wasn't good for Rome?
123	T/B:	Brutus thinks he wasn't a bad person but he just wasn't good for Rome. So why let him talk?
124	MAT:	because- Antony is only gonna say how he was a good person by saying
125		he wasn't right for Rome.
126	T/B:	Cassius isn't real keen on this idea, Brutus seems to really

		think that they should do it.
127		What does this say about Brutus.
128	TYI:	Brutus on one side- Cassius looks on the bad side of things.
129		Brutus always looking on the good side?
130	T/B:	who's going to be right.
131	Female ST:	Cassius?

Germaine says that, from Brutus' point of view, Caesar "wasn't a bad person." And Tyisha adds that "Cassius looks on the bad side of things [while] Brutus [is] always looking on the good side." Despite the cynicism of Cassius and other conspirators, Brutus believes that Antony will act honorably. Students do not seem strongly committed to this view of Brutus, but at several points they give him a positive voice.

194	T/B:	what did Brutus seem to think about people? (10.0)
195	CAS:	that they should have the decisions? Like who should be king and stuff? (4.0)
196	T/B:	I don't think he wants a king. 'cause that's why he gets rid of Caesar.
		You think he thinks people
197		should have decisions? Be able to make decisions?
198	LAK:	yeah. Because he do what they want? Like um when he got them- the letters that's when he start
199		changin' his mind? 'cause he give the people of Rome what they want?

In response to the teacher's question "what did Brutus seem to think about people," Cassandra says: "that they should have the decisions...like who should be king and stuff?" Tyisha immediately concurs, saying that "he give the people of Rome what they want." At this point in the discussion, at least some students presuppose that Brutus is defending the interests of the Roman people. Just as in the earlier segment, when students presented Brutus as thinking well of people, here students assign him the positive voice of a politician who is concerned to honor the people's wishes.

Bakhtin claims that both novelists and speakers like Mrs. Bailey and the students do more than assign voices to literary characters. In addition, novelists have "the gift of indirect speaking" (1961/1986:110). They make their points by positioning themselves with respect to others' voices, not by speaking directly in their own. Narrative discourse contains at least three layers: it refers to and characterizes narrated objects; it presupposes voices for the characters who are represented; and it establishes a political and ethical position for the narrator himself or herself. Bakhtin uses the term "ventriloquation" to describe how a novelist positions himself or herself by speaking through others' voices. All utterances are "filled with others' words.... These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate" (1953/1986:89). By re-accentuating others' voices, narrators and ordinary speakers can establish positions for themselves. Bakhtin presents this metaphorically as "ventriloquating" others' voices.

In discussing *Julius Caesar*, one could take at least two views of Brutus – i.e., there are at least two possible sorts of ventriloquation that an author or interpreter might adopt. It might be admirable of Brutus to think well of people, despite the fact that in Roman politics, as elsewhere, nice guys often finish last. Or it might be foolish of him to believe that Antony would keep his word or would value the good of Rome above his own self-interest. Early in the classroom discussion, the students have not yet firmly adopted one of these positions, but they seem to be initially inclined toward the former.

Mrs. Bailey, however, adopts the latter sort of ventriloquation. For instance, her use of "right" at line 130 presupposes that Brutus was wrong to think well of Antony. As the discussion continues, Mrs. Bailey takes a definite position with respect to Brutus: he is foolish to have faith in people and she is wise enough to know better.

229	T/B:	play this off. I mean- is Brutus listening to the plebeians or is Brutus listening to
230		some other voices within the community of Rome? (2.0) when people say let's get rid of Caesar is he
231		listening to the shopkeepers and the cobblers like we ran into at the beginning
232	JAS:	no (4.0)
233	T/B:	Who's he listening to Jasmine
234	JAS:	the patricians (3.0)
235	T/B:	OK so what does that tell us about Brutus. (8.0) OK- I just wanted to make sure that we get it out
236		on the table that good old Brutus is not out saying all the little people in Rome should get a vote or
237		something. He believes that this should be a continuation of the way things have been. Which is that
238		you've got a republican form of government with the patricians basically ruling and there's some
239		representation of the plebians through the tribuneship isn't there, if I remember my history right. (3.0).
240		OK? (1.0) There's another aspect of Brutus though. You were- making reference to it before. Brutus
241		thinks well of people doesn't he? (2.0) and Cassius seems to suspect people. Let's keep that one in mind
242		also. OK let's go on and see what this guy Antony does.

At line 236 Mrs. Bailey refers to Brutus as "good old Brutus." This seems to mock the students' earlier voicing of Brutus as "good" (i.e., as a true democrat), and it suggests that Mrs. Bailey does not see him as good. She goes on to give an imagined quotation, one that in her opinion Brutus would never say: "all the little people in Rome should get a vote." Her use of "little people" here, like her use of "good old Brutus," seems to mock the students' faith in Brutus as a democrat. Brutus, she suggests, thought of the Roman plebeians as little people, not as worthy of substantial political representation. Just as Brutus was naïve to think that Antony would not act in his own self-interest, the students are naïve to think that Brutus was

a true democrat. Mrs. Bailey apparently would expect Antony and Brutus to act in their own self-interest, not for higher principles like honor or the good of the people.

Just as with the question of whether Brutus is admirable or naïve, reasonable people could differ on how to interpret Brutus' democratic instincts. An author or commentator might position himself or herself as an admirer of representative forms of government. A commentator adopting this position could acknowledge that Rome was not a democracy, while nonetheless noting that a limited representative government is better than a dictatorship-and perhaps Brutus has something in common with us modern democrats if this is in fact the sort of government he favored. The students might have adopted this position, given their initial reactions to the teacher's questions about Brutus. But Mrs. Bailey adopts a different ventriloquation. She voices Brutus as an elitist – a rich man out to maintain the privileges of his own class. She positions herself as wise enough to know that politicians like Brutus are not actually defending the interests of the common people.

Bakhtin's discussions of authorial positioning describe how a novelist, in representing interactions among voices, inevitably takes an evaluative position on those voices. Dickens, for example, often scoffs at self-righteous businessmen and the 19th century English society that valorized them (cf. Wertsch 1991). I argue that teachers and students discussing literature are in this respect similar to novelists. Like novelists, teachers and students identify with certain voices while distancing themselves from others. The author has already juxtaposed and evaluated voices in a certain way, but teachers and students add another layer of ventriloquation. By their responses to the voices that certain characters speak with, teachers and students take political and ethical positions with respect to voices and with respect to larger social issues.

In her voicing and ventriloquation of Brutus, Mrs. Bailey takes a relatively cynical position on whether it is naïve to think well of people and whether politicians routinely act in their own self-interest. Her position is not the only one possible on these political and ethical questions, although it is certainly plausible in some respects. The following analyses of the voicing and ventriloquation that teacher and students adopt with respect to Antony and the Roman plebeians show that Mrs. Bailey continues to adopt a relatively cynical position throughout the class discussion. The analysis will also show that students seem to adopt even more cynical positioning with respect to Antony and the plebeians.

Before proceeding to analyze how the students and teacher voice Antony, two qualifications are necessary. First, the few utterances described so far do not provide definitive evidence for teacher and students' positions. By speaking as they did, the teacher and students put "into play" the types of positioning that I have described. Mrs. Bailey's cynicism toward Brutus, and perhaps toward politicians in general, can now be coherently presupposed by others in this interaction. But if she changes her positioning in

subsequent talk, the few utterances described in this section might not turn out to be central. Any discourse analysis of this sort must have the methodological discipline not to point to a few isolated utterances as definitive evidence for one interpretation. Instead, we must look for more extensive patterns of utterances that emerge over the course of an interaction (Hymes 1996; Silverstein 1985, 1998; Wortham 1996, 2001a; Wortham & Locher 1996). The analyses in subsequent sections describe a more extensive pattern of utterances, one that I will argue comes strongly to presuppose a cynical position both for Mrs. Bailey and for the students.

Second, Mrs. Bailey may well be right in her reading of Shakespeare. Shakespeare himself probably evaluated Brutus more cynically, as Mrs. Bailey does. So in pushing students toward this reading, Mrs. Bailey is doing her job as an English teacher. In addition, however, she is also communicating something about the nature of politics and the typical relationships between politicians and the common people. Compelling literature like this engages issues that still apply to contemporary readers. While discussing such literature, teachers and students also adopt political and ethical positions on the issues raised by the literature. Bakhtin argues that novelists generally cannot help but ventriloquate their characters' voices. Similarly, I argue that classroom discussions of compelling literature often involve two simultaneous and interconnected levels of activity: discussion of the text, to help students develop plausible interpretations of the subject matter; and positioning oneself with respect to the types of political and ethical questions made salient by the text.

Antony

As was the case with Brutus, most students do not seem to have strong opinions about Antony at the beginning of the discussion. Insofar as they express an opinion, they give him a positive voice. In many places, however, the teacher voices Antony as scheming and manipulative. She starts this voicing in her initial question to the class.

9	T/B:	Okay, Antony is going to talk to the people, and what do we know about what Antony is planning?
10		[background conversation unintelligible]
11	T/B:	shshhh! OK, give me a break. What do we know about what Antony's up to? Okay, Germaine louder

When she restates her question, she asks: "what do we know about what Antony is up to." Saying that someone is "up to" something often presupposes the person is scheming and engaged in morally questionable activities. Mrs. Bailey's use of this term might presuppose that Antony is scheming against the plotters and manipulating the Roman plebeians. But this one cue does not establish a definitive voice for Antony, and the teacher does not presuppose anything else of this sort about Antony until later in

the discussion.

Later on the teacher does say several more things that presuppose a scheming, manipulative voice for Antony. In this passage they are discussing whether Antony violates his agreement not to say anything against Brutus and the other conspirators.

475	T/B:	Well- why would he want to stop before he got carried away. (1.0)
476	NAT:	That's not in the agreement. You don't start talkin' and talking too much
477	T/B:	He was not supposed to go against the agreement. And he's kinda skirtin' the edges of the
478		agreement here. But why stop at this point. What is he' going to do?
479	Female ST:	Gonna let the people talk? Say something.
480	T/B:	Why would he want the people to say something.
481	Female ST:	He wants to see what they thinking? so he knows if he's convinced to take away or let
482		the people know that (1.0) what he say- is kinda sink in their heads so they can help 'im
483	T/B:	So he's stopping to find out what, kind of effect he's having on his audience

When she says "he's kinda skirting the edges of the agreement here" (lines 477-478), Mrs. Bailey presupposes both that Antony is not keeping his word to the conspirators and that he is skillfully using his speech to influence the Roman plebeians without explicitly condemning the conspirators.

At several other points the teacher presupposes that Antony is scheming against the conspirators and manipulating the plebeians to join his side and overthrow the conspirators. She asks "what is he [Antony] setting up in people's minds" (line 425), and she says "now he's [Antony] got them [plebeians] revved up to hear it" (line 580). Both "setting up in people's minds" and "got them revved up" presuppose that he is manipulating the plebeians. Later on, she says that Antony's "got them- he's playing them, and he's got- he's pretty sure he's got them on a line now" (lines 593-594)- an image that again presupposes Antony is manipulating the plebeians. At another point Mrs. Bailey reads lines from Antony's speech herself, using intonation that indicates her own position. They have been discussing an alleged will of Caesar's, and Antony has implied that the plebeians are beneficiaries of the will.

551	T/B:	so do you think the will has something about the patricians in it. Or is it dealing with the
552		common folk?
553	Female STS:	I think its dealin' with the common folk.
554	Female ST:	I think its dealing with the people.
555	T/B:	Okay? So- again we've gone through this thing. He says I don't plan on stirring you up to
556		mutiny and rage (1.0) because I would do Brutus and Cassius wrong who you know are HONorable

557		MEN?
558	MRC:	to be sarcastic?
559	NAT:	If they so honorable why did they kill Caesar.

When Mrs. Bailey reads from Antony's speech (at lines 555-557), she uses a sarcastic tone of voice to say "honorable men." In enacting Antony's role here, she makes clear that she sees him as scheming against the conspirators and manipulating the plebeians.

The students, as shown in lines 558-559, pick up on Mrs. Bailey's voicing of Antony. Throughout the second half of the class discussion, in fact, the students adopt the teacher's voicing of Antony in several places. In the following segment, the students carry on their own discussion of whether Antony really means it when he says Brutus is an honorable man.

399	MRC:	Then why would he say Brutus is a honorable man if he didn't think so too.
400	JAS:	I don't think he think so. I think he just- you know.
401	TYI:	He gotta say something good. You know he can't just come flat out Brutus is bad, Caesar-
402		You can't come flat out.
403	STS:	[3 sec overlapping comments]
404	JAS:	you know like- they know like- OK? He mentioning like the good things. Caesar did.
405		and then. you know and then [Brutus killed him.
406	Female ST:	[he'll
407	TYI:	[yeah. yeah.
408	JAS:	he said like Brutus is an honorable man but he killed Caesar. like that.
409	CAN:	proves this is wrong. and trying to get the people to stop- you know
410	JAS:	but he not going to say it right out.
411	Male & Female STS:	[3 sec. overlapping comments.]
412	MRC:	So he's just trying to be sarcastic.

Here Tyisha explicitly characterizes part of Antony's strategy: because the conspirators are in control of Rome at the moment, he cannot say "flat out" that Brutus is a bad person for killing Caesar. Jasmine then goes on to characterize the rest of the strategy. Antony juxtaposes his praise for Caesar with his statement that Brutus is an honorable man, such that the audience will likely infer sarcasm on Antony's part. Later in the discussion, Candace summarizes Antony's plan to manipulate the plebeians. She says that Antony is "trying to get people to change their minds. Minds are changing in each of the steps 'cause after he talks their minds'll keep changing and changing, and today like yeah let's go after Brutus" (lines 507-509). As shown in these segments, several of the students clearly understand and themselves adopt the voicing of Antony that has been presupposed by Mrs. Bailey. They explicitly describe him as scheming to overthrow the conspirators and as manipulating the Roman plebeians in order to accomplish this goal.

Mrs. Bailey and the students almost surely have Shakespeare's voicing

of Antony right, and in guiding them to this conclusion the teacher is doing a skillful job. In fact, in a conversation immediately following this class Mrs. Bailey and the two outside observers in the class (a prospective student teacher and me) agreed that this had been a particularly productive class and that the students seemed to learn a lot. In retrospect, our judgments were based on two factors: that a large group of students clearly understood Shakespeare's voicing of Antony and provided evidence from the text to support their conclusions; and that students directed some important parts of the discussion themselves, without relying on Mrs. Bailey to lead them. In both of these respects I continue to believe that this class was successful in teaching the curriculum.

At the same time as students were learning about Shakespeare's characterization of Antony, they were also taking political and ethical positions on issues of continuing relevance. Almost all interpreters would agree that Antony does in fact scheme to manipulate the plebeians and overthrow the conspirators, but the ventriloquation of this voice raises more contested questions. But an author or commentator could position himself or herself in at least two different ways. One might be horrified by Antony's plans. Antony, after all, intends to start a horrible civil war in which many plebeians will be killed, just because he wants to avenge Caesar and gain power for himself. Or a commentator could position himself or herself as wise enough to realize that this is how the political world is. Politicians are out to defend their own interests, and little people often get hurt in the process. These are not the only two positions one could take on Antony's plans, but the plausibility of at least these two positions shows that reasonable people could differ on this salient ethical issue raised by the play. I argue that – just as novelists do not often speak "from nowhere," but instead position themselves with respect to the voices of their salient characters – Mrs. Bailey and the students end up taking a position on Antony's actions.

The Plebeians

The teacher and students take a position on Antony's scheme as they voice and ventriloquate the plebeians. There are at least two possibilities. They could voice the plebeians as being unjustifiably victimized by Antony's machinations and position themselves as horrified by Antony and sympathetic to the plebeians. Or they could voice the plebeians as deserving what they get and position themselves as cynical.

Early in the discussion, Mrs. Bailey pointed out an irony in the Roman plebeians' response to Brutus.

140	T/B	When we finish- when Brutus finishes his speech, what do the people want to do. (1.0)
141	GER:	Crown Brutus
142	T/B:	hhnh, crown him. Do you see anything ironic in the fact that the people now want to crown

143		Brutus? (2.0)
144	Female STS:	[overlapping unintelligible talk]
145	T/B:	I am sorry.
146	CAN:	I said the people are silly?
147	T/B:	The people are silly.
148	CAN:	Its like somebody dies- first they like- and then when Caesar overcame him they said Let's Cr-
149		Yo caesar, Let's crown Caesar. and then when Caesar gets in power and then Brutus' conspiracy
150		that killed him uh, Caesar and then um- Now they want to crown Brutus because um. I mean that's
151		kind of silly.
152	Female ST:	Maybe they just want to go with the people with the most power? they think, maybe
153		they think they'll get a deal out of them or somethin'.
154	T/B:	They go with the people with the most power to get a better deal.
155		You know, I'm just wondering, what did Brutus say in his speech though.
156	TYR:	he said- Caesar's trying to get too much power, he's too ambitious, so we had to kill him.
157	T/B:	So what does it tell you if people want to make him king and Brutus has just given this whole
158		speech saying what was wrong with Caesar is he'd got too ambitious, he wanted to get too much power,
159		he wanted to be king?
160	TYR:	people are too closed minded.

The irony that Mrs. Bailey points out at line 142, and that Candace immediately picks up at lines 146ff., characterizes the plebeians as fickle and inconsistent – they cheer Brutus for killing Caesar the dictator and then immediately want to make Brutus a dictator. At line 152 a student attributes a more rational, if unflattering, motive to the plebeians, suggesting that they are looking out for their own self-interest. But at line 157 Mrs. Bailey directs them away from this reading, toward voicing the plebeians as more fickle and irrational. Other students then pick up this voicing for the plebeians.

168	CAS:	that they just jumpin' at the first thing they see? like if some thing good- like if you buyin'
169		clothes or somethin'? go to the store- it's real nice and it's high priced sort of- you just jump at
170		it? get it? and you walk to another [store afterwards, it's cheaper-
171	CAN:	[but it's ugly and you don't want to ever
172	CAS:	but it's cheaper and now you feel
173	CAN:	and you're like hey, I got this? but I got stuck with this. go uh.
174	TYI:	I know? take it [back?
175	Female ST:	[uh. Hnhnhn
176	T/B:	OK, you can t(hh)ake it b(hh)ack when you're talking about clothing? what do you do about

177	Female ST:	sometimes you can't take it back.
178	Female ST:	I don't take no clothes back.
179	STS:	[1 sec overlapping comments]
180	T/B:	what do you- what do you do about political leaders though? (1.0) you just jump one
181		way or the other, what do you do about, you know- what do you do about a political leader.
182		can you just say oh, made a mistake? This one's gonna be better over here.

Cassandra presents an analogy to describe the plebeians' behavior: they are picking political leaders, and perhaps even forms of government, the way a fickle and impulsive shopper would respond to commodities in a store. Mrs. Bailey laughs about this analogy at line 176, and she points out that changing political leaders can be more difficult than returning commodities to a store. The students agree with this, but they say that the Roman plebeians are nonetheless treating their political choices this way. Before changing the topic to Brutus, the teacher summarizes the voice that students and teacher together seem to be presupposing for the fickle plebeians: "they're jumping from one to the other" (line 188).

In their discussion from lines 139-188, the teacher and students work together to voice the plebeians as fickle and foolish in their attitudes toward politicians. The teacher may have introduced this voicing with her question at line 142 and reinforced it with her question at line 157, but the students quickly pick it up and expand it. The teacher does not simply impose this harsh or cynical attitude toward the common people on the students. The teacher does adopt a relatively cynical position with respect to the plebeians, and with respect to Brutus and Antony as well. It would also be partly correct to say that, at least during this classroom discussion, many students adopt the teacher's cynical position with respect to politicians' motives and with respect to the worth and intelligence of the common people. But the students do not passively adopt the teacher's positioning. Instead they actively appropriate and elaborate it.

The following segment further illustrates how the students go beyond the teacher in their voicing of the plebeians. The first few lines of this segment show students reading from the text two lines spoken by Roman plebeians.

493	Female ST:	There is not a nobler man in Rome than Antony?
494	Female STS:	hahahaha
495	Female ST:	now mark him? he begins again to speak?
496	Female STS:	hnhhahaha
497	T/B:	what has happened.
498	Female ST:	they changed their attitude?
499	Lakisha:	they silly.
500	STS:	hahahahahahah
501	TYI:	anybody. I betcha I could go to Rome and set up there and say

502		Antony is wrong? [CROWN Tyisha!
503	Male & Female STS:	[hahahhah HAHAhahhahaahahahahah
504	T/B:	Is everybody in his camp yet. I mean is everybody there saying Antony is right, Caesar was
505		wrong?
506	TYI:	No, just us.
507	CAN:	trying to say, in a way trying to get people to change their minds? minds are changing in each
508		of the steps cause after he talks their minds'll keep changing and changing. and today like yeah
509		let's go after Brutus?

In this segment Tyisha calls the plebeians "silly," and immediately following this segment Maurice calls them "stupid," both of which follow the voicing that teacher and students established earlier. Tyisha also gives a hypothetical example that characterizes the Roman plebeians. She imagines herself going to Rome, getting on the stage and saying that Antony is wrong – just as he has implied that Brutus is wrong – and she proposes that the plebeians would be fickle and foolish enough to demand her coronation, even though they know nothing about her. Candace gives a similar characterization of the fickle plebeians when she describes how "minds'll keep changing and changing," and when she puts words into the plebeians mouths; after just having called for Brutus to become king, they are now responding to Antony by saying "let's go after [i.e., kill] Brutus."

In *Julius Caesar*, Brutus lets Antony address the Romans and Antony starts a horrible civil war without regard for the plebeians who might be killed. The teacher and students in this classroom discussion adopt a definite position on these events. Brutus was foolish to think well of people and to expect Antony to keep his word, instead of realizing that politicians act in their own self-interest. And the plebeians were foolish in their choice of leaders, so much so that they probably deserved what they got.

As described above, this might constitute a good reading of the play. Shakespeare might have ventriloquated his characters in this way, and so the teacher and students might simply be doing good pedagogical work in adopting the position they do. But the teacher and the students do not simply adopt an academic position on the subject matter. The classroom talk has multiple functions here – both describing the subject matter and positioning them as particular kinds of people with respect to political and ethical issues that continue to be important in contemporary societies. At the same time as they learn the curriculum, teacher and students adopt political and ethical positions that have implications for their own lives. This becomes clear in the following segment.

212	T/B:	the patricians. OK why would patricians be writing and not plebians.
213	TYI:	because the- they high class?
214	T/B:	uhuh

215	TYI:	and the others are like low class?
216	T/B:	uhuh.
217	TKO:	yeah so they [
218	TYI:	[so you know you pay more attention to high class people than you do low class.
219	T/B:	you do-
220	TYI:	yeah I do.
221	Female STS:	hnhhnhhnh
222	LAK:	I mean it's true though? You know if you-
223	TYI:	if you saw a bunch of nerds talking and you had some popular people talking, you won't listen
224		to them you listen to the popular people.

Here Tyisha draws an analogy between the plebeians and the "nerds" that she encounters in school. If she does in fact think about and act toward "low class" people in the way that students have positioned themselves with respect to the plebeians, then this classroom literature discussion might create or reinforce insidious divisions between types of people. At least on this occasion, many students and the teacher do position themselves as more cynical and worldly, and they do act as if the plebians deserve mistreatment. If they position themselves this way with respect to stereotyped groups at other times, this might lead some students to mistreat people from stigmatized social groups. This would be unfortunate, given that they are all members of social classes or ethnic groups that often get stereotyped. Based just on data from one classroom discussion, however, we cannot know if the students' positioning was transitory or more enduring. It would take more data to establish whether the positioning accomplished in this discussion does in fact recur elsewhere in students' lives.

Conclusions

I have argued that teachers and students discussing literature are in some ways like novelists. Just as Bakhtin describes novelists positioning themselves with respect to the types of people they portray, teachers and students often take positions on the types of people and the political issues raised by literature. This positioning can involve political and ethical issues of continuing relevance. For instance, we must all make choices about how to conceptualize and how to treat "nerds" and other stereotyped groups. In their classroom discussion of *Julius Caesar*, Mrs. Bailey and the students (provisionally) positioned themselves on the question of how we should treat such groups.

But the existence of such positioning does not mean classroom literature discussions have no pedagogical value. Political and ethical positioning does not happen *instead* of productive pedagogical conversation about the curriculum, but *interconnected* with it. The positioning illustrated in this article builds on the curriculum but does not necessarily interfere with it. In the case from *Julius Caesar*, in fact, Mrs. Bailey effectively guided stu-

dents to greater understanding of the curriculum at the same time as she and the students positioned themselves with respect to issues raised by that curriculum. Classroom discourse can simultaneously represent important aspects of the curriculum and position speakers with respect to salient political issues.

Teachers and students do differ from novelists in at least one important respect, however. Novelists are generally aware of and exercise deliberate control over the positions they take. In classroom literature discussions – as well as in many other types of discourse (Wortham 2001a) – teachers and students sometimes *enact* ethical and political positions without being fully aware of their actions (Wortham 1994). Mrs. Bailey and the students may have been focused on their interpretations of Shakespeare such that they did not realize the extent of their own cynical positioning with respect to the plebeians. (I wish that I had been able to ask at the time, but I myself was unaware of the issue as I observed this class. It took so long to do the analyses that interviews with participants were no longer feasible.)

This raises interesting questions for practice. Given that particular ethical and political positions can be controversial, should teachers try to reduce or eliminate positioning? I do not think so. I say this partly because positioning is too pervasive to be eliminated (Wortham 1994, 2001a; Davies & Harré 1990). But positioning might also be a pedagogical tool.

As I have argued elsewhere, students' positioning can help them learn the curriculum (Wortham 2001b). Part of the curriculum in teaching Julius Caesar involves the subordinate position of the Roman plebeians. Students should understand how others viewed the plebeians and how they thought about themselves. But in some cases students may not readily conceptualize the exclusion and stereotyping involved. In such cases, teachers might take advantage of the students' ability to enact exclusion and stereotyping. When students like Tyisha can enact exclusion and stereotyping in class, by positioning themselves with respect to "nerds," but cannot yet conceptualize it, enactment alone can be pedagogically productive. Even when it is not fully conscious, the enactment of patterns similar to those raised in the curriculum can facilitate students' cognition (Wortham 2001b).

In cases where their positioning may be out of awareness, teachers and students can also sometimes reflect on their positioning after the fact. Such reflection can not only help students learn the curriculum, but it can also help them engage with larger ethical and political questions. Lensmire (1994) advocates a "critically pragmatic response" to ethically controversial issues and positions that arise in classrooms. Teachers and students can reflect on their own positioning as part of the educational process – for example, discussing the fate of stigmatized or underprivileged social groups, both as an issue in the curriculum and as an issue in their own everyday lives. Compelling literature raises political and ethical positions on issues of continuing relevance, and literature classrooms can provide a protected forum to critique the types of positioning that we often adopt unreflectively

in everyday life.

One important question for practice remains. Should teachers themselves take political and ethical positions, or should they struggle against this? Sometimes teacher positioning can be part of productive pedagogy – as when teachers play "devil's advocate" to provoke students into thinking more deeply. But it might also be productive to follow Dostoevsky's example. Bakhtin (1963/1984) describes Dostoevsky as deliberately not taking a position with respect to the voices he represented in his novels. Dostoevsky was able to represent both religious believers and non-believers, for instance, without himself taking a position that undermined either view. If Mrs. Bailey had done this, she would have left open more positions-both cynicism toward and horror at Antony's actions, for example. Bakhtin argues that Dostoevsky's refusal to take a position allows richer "dialogue" among the voices he portrays. If teachers sometimes deliberately encouraged multiple positions on the political issues raised in literature, this might allow productive dialogue among students.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the National Academy of Education, the Spencer Foundation and the University of Pennsylvania Research Foundation for their support of this research.

References

Adler, M. (1983). *The Paideia proposal*. NY: Macmillan.

Bakhtin, M. (1935[1981]). Discourse in the novel. In M. Bakhtin, *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1953[1986]). The problem of speech genres. In M. Bakhtin, *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1961[1986]). The problem of the text in linguistics, philology, and the human sciences. In M. Bakhtin, *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1963/1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, translator). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, C. (1996). Selective traditions. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning and schooling*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*, 43-63.

Dyson, A. & Freedman, S. (1991). Writing. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp & J. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. NY: Macmillan.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hicks, D. (1996). Contextual inquiries. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning and schooling*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1996). Ethnopoetics and sociolinguistics. In D. Hymes, *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality*. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.

Lensmire, T. (1994). *When children write*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (p. 21). Washington: American Educational Research Association.

Schultz, K. & Fecho, B. (2000). Society's child: Social context and writing development. *Educational Psychologist, 35,* 51-62.

Schuster, C. (1997). Mikhail Bakhtin as rhetorical theorist. In V. Villanueva, Jr. (Ed.), *Cross talk in composition theory*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Silverstein, M. (1985). On the pragmatic "poetry" of prose. In D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, form and use in context*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Silverstein, M. (1998). The improvisational performance of "culture" in realtime discursive practice. In K. Sawyer, (Ed.), *Improvisation*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wortham, S. (1994). *Acting out participant examples in the classroom*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wortham, S. (1996). Mapping participant deictics: A technique for discovering speakers' footing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25,* 331-348.

Wortham, S. (2001a). *Narratives in Action*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wortham, S. (2001b). Interactionally situated cognition. *Cognitive Science, 25,* 13-42.

Wortham, S. & M. Locher. (1996). Voicing on the news: An analytic technique for studying media bias. *Text, 16,* 557-585.

Stanton Wortham is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Educational Leadership Division at the Penn Graduate School of Education. His doctorate is from the University of Chicago. His research applies techniques from linguistic anthropology to uncover social positioning in apparently neutral talk. He studies how interactional and social patterns can go on under the surface of classroom discussions about subject matter. He has also studied interactional positioning that speakers accomplish in media discourse and in autobiographical narrative.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

'-'	abrupt breaks or stops
'?'	rising intonation
'.'	falling intonation
'_'	(underline) stress
(1.0)	silences, timed to the nearest second
'['	indicates simultaneous talk by two speakers, with one utterance represented on top of the other and the moment of overlap marked by left brackets
'[...]'	transcriber comment
','	pause or breath without marked intonation
'(hh)'	laughter breaking into words while speaking

Culture, Identity, and Asian American Teens: A School District Conference Panel Discussion

Angela Reyes

University of Pennsylvania

This paper analyzes a school district conference panel discussion to illustrate how "culture" is an interactionally emergent construct and "identity" is performatively achieved through struggles to position the self and other in socially meaningful ways. In the interaction between the panel of Asian American teens and the audience of teachers, advisors, and administrators, the term "culture" emerges as two distinct constructs. This is accomplished, in part, through emergent poetic and indexical patterning which shape categories and trajectories of personae to which speech event participants are recruited. The analysis shows how the first schema invokes culture as "historical transmission" and questions the positioning of the teen panel as authentic recipients of this transmittable essence. The second schema invokes culture as "emblem of ethnic differentiation" and allows teens to raise concerns about their own ethnic recognizability in American society. This paper argues that these two schemas of culture are not merely static essences, but dynamically linked to distinct participation frameworks which achieve particular performative effects.

Introduction

A school district conference constitutes a type of public sphere in which individuals customarily meet and engage in discussions of common interest. The workshops that take place therein provide fruitful sites for investigating how public sphere discourses "fashion specific personae and, by their very nature, bring these personae into circulation before a large audience" (Agha 1999:4). Indeed, these discourses potentially have great impact on an individual or group's "culture" and "identity". But how exactly do we go about investigating the inter-relations among discourse, culture and identity? This paper attempts to address this question through a linguistic anthropological approach to discourse analysis which investigates how presupposed cultural categories are mapped onto, or transformed into, that which emerges distinctively

through the details of the interaction. Thus, we must look to the microsociological order of language use.

This paper analyzes a school district conference panel discussion to illustrate how "culture" is an interactionally emergent construct and "identity" is performatively achieved through struggles to position the self and other in socially meaningful ways. In the interaction between the panel of Asian American teens and the audience of teachers, advisors, and administrators, the term "culture" emerges as two distinct constructs. This is accomplished, in part, through emergent poetic and indexical patterning which shape categories and trajectories of personae to which speech event participants are recruited. The analysis illustrates how these two schemas of culture – "culture as historical transmission" and "culture as emblem of ethnic differentiation" – are not merely static essences, but dynamically linked to distinct participation frameworks which achieve particular performative effects. Since this interactional event occurs within a public sphere, these schemas of culture and identity are brought forth into circulation, and reveal how metadiscursive macro-constructs such as "multiculturalism" and "identity politics" are played out rather vividly in micro-level interaction.

Background

The School District of Philadelphia invited a panel of Asian American teens to present a workshop at the "All Means All, Diversity and Equity Issues and Solutions in Education" school district conference in spring 2000[1]. The panel was invited because the teens are engaged in an after-school videomaking project at the Asian Arts Initiative, a community arts organization in Philadelphia. For over two years, I have been conducting ethnographic research on the videomaking project and have been involved as a volunteer facilitator, coordinator and researcher. During the conference workshop, the teen-produced video was screened and then followed by a discussion. In this paper, I analyze discourse excerpts from this discussion. Although the chosen excerpts do not explicitly address videomaking nor the video itself, the screening of the video was important in that it provided the backdrop for the panel discussion. Thus, following are brief descriptions of the processes of production and consumption of the video created through the teen videomaking project.

Production

Like many other community arts organizations, the Asian Arts Initiative is grounded in the belief that political activism through the arts can lead to social change. Willis (1990) states that "[t]hough subordinated and

[1] I would like to thank the School District of Philadelphia for allowing me to identify them and the conference in this paper.

often marginalized, the many strands of the community arts movement ... share the continuing concern to democratize the arts and make them more a part of common experience" (1990:4). By fostering a sense that art belongs to everyday people and can help build a collective political and cultural voice for underrepresented populations such as Asian Americans, the Asian Arts Initiative engages teens in the art of videomaking. Each year, the after-school teen videomaking project engages a group of about twenty Asian American teens from throughout Philadelphia – mostly Cambodian, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Lao – in a six-month process of scripting, shooting and editing their own group video which reflects their real-life experiences and perspectives.

The fifteen-minute video that was screened at the conference workshop is titled "American Sroksrei" ("rice paddy" or "countryside" in Khmer). The Asian Arts Initiative's video premiere postcard describes it as:

> "Set against the lively backdrop of South Philadelphia, 'American Sroksrei' follows three fictional Asian high school students through their daily dilemmas: the dreams of first generation Asian American teenagers; the expectations of immigrant parents; and the pull towards gang culture and violence" (11/10/99).

"American Sroksrei" has a unique history constituted through a series of realtime discursive events. However, the emphasis in this paper is not on the video itself because although there are interactional processes which lead to its creation, we cannot say that there is an intrinsic meaning encoded in the video alone (Silverstein & Urban 1996; Willis 1990). Rather, it is only as the video is contextualized in situated events of consumption, that meanings can be made. The emphasis, therefore, is on consumption.

Consumption

Willis (1990) states that "[i]t is pointless to judge artefacts alone, outside their social relations of consumption" (1990:21, emphasis in original). Rather, we must study how meanings emerge as "media audiences play an active role in the interpretation and appropriation of media texts" (Spitulnik 1997:165). "American Sroksrei" has been screened in several locations ranging from classrooms to museums to conferences. The teen producers are often present at these screenings so that audience members have the opportunity to ask questions about media production and the issues raised in the video. Setting, participants, and other contextual features influence the ways in which the video is consumed and interpreted, leading to all different kinds of emergent and negotiated meanings.

Consumption is production. That is, through the event of consuming (e.g., reading a newspaper, watching TV), audiences are constantly in a

process of creating meanings and relationships (de Certeau 1984; Willis 1990). Likewise, as audiences consume the teen-created video at screening discussions, they create relationships with the video itself, as well as with the teen producers. These situated discursive events of consumption involve spatial configurations, roles, rituals and performances that are produced with others. Not only do these conditions shape the organization of interaction, they are also resources to be discovered, explored and exploited (Willis 1990).

The speech event

The five Asian American teens who constitute the school district conference panel all live in South Philadelphia and attend various high schools throughout Philadelphia. Although a few of the teens are of mixed ethnic heritage, they all come from homes where Khmer is spoken as the primary language. Following are brief descriptions of the speech event participants:[2]

Panel participants (6):

- Cham, Heng, Phila, Phal, Tha (all males except Phila)
- Angie (panel moderator from Asian Arts Initiative)

Audience participants (27):

- Anu, Grace, Mai (from Asian Arts Initiative)
- Rita (workshop facilitator and school district administrator)
- Sapna (school district administrator and member of Asian Arts Initiative)
- A, AF (female), AM (male) (other audience member(s) comprised of school district teachers, advisors, and administrators)

The 90-minute conference workshop took place on a Saturday morning in April 2000. At the front of the room were a TV/VCR, a podium, and a long table with chairs for each of the teen panelists. The audience sat in rows of chairs facing the panel. At the beginning of the session, I introduced the workshop, panelists, and the after-school teen videomaking project. Next, Mai introduced the Asian Arts Initiative followed by an icebreaker game facilitated by Anu and Cham. Tha introduced "American Sroksrei" which was then screened and followed by a 30-minute moderated discussion. The panel discussion was audio-recorded and transcribed.

Role-inhabitances and identity

Within the borders of formal schooling, the everyday encounters between high school students and their teachers constitute ritualized

[2] All names used in this paper are pseudonyms except my own, "Angie."

spatiotemporal situated events (e.g., academic lessons in the classroom) with often clearly defined and hierarchical roles (e.g., teacher-student). However, in this conference setting, the discussion between the panel of Asian American teens and the audience of teachers, advisors, and administrators may bring into play new configurations of "role-inhabitances" (Silverstein 1998). That is, the "status" and "role" (Cicourel 1974) of "teacher-student" may be renegotiated as new role-inhabitances such as "audience-panel", "questioner-answerer", "knowledge seeker-knowledge bearer" (to name just a few) are made relevant in the interaction. As participants take up these ratified role-inhabitances, we can derive the social identities invoked, contested, and transformed.

Through public performances of video screening discussions, then, the social hierarchy is always potentially up for renegotiation. Whether existing social relations are inadvertently perpetuated or radically challenged, conversation can never be neutral. It is always tied to issues of power and identity to varying degrees. Thus, in this panel discussion, social identities and interpersonal relationships among students, teachers, advisors, and administrators may be transformed or redefined. Prior configurations of role-inhabitances (e.g., teacher-student, audience-panel), particularly ones repeatedly achieved, may serve as metadiscursive backdrops as participants project these alignments onto this panel discussion. Yet, in the realm of social identities and relations, there are always multiple possible configurations that can emerge as participants construct, challenge and negotiate their positionings in situated events.

So it is clear that, rather than being fixed, identities can be performed to position the self in creative ways (Bauman & Briggs 1990; Butler 1990; Wortham 1994, 2001). This cannot be accomplished alone as positioning is highly contingent on setting, participants, and ratification of interlocutors. As participants in the panel discussion performatively position themselves and each other, identities become inhabited and transformations of social relations and the self may be possible. In order to systematically analyze how these social identities emerge in situated interaction, we need a mediated account of language use.

Language use

Language use is a form of social action. That is, when we speak, we not only "say something", we most necessarily "do something". Put another way, language use not only refers and predicates in what Jakobson (1971 [1951]) calls the "narrated event", it also functions to interactionally align those involved in the "narrating event". Silverstein (1993) uses the parallel terms, "denotational text" and "interactional text", to refer to these two types of coherence that discursive interaction can be taken to manifest. The denotational text is a coherent representation of content, the "what's being talked about." In the interactional text, a recognizable interaction coheres

as the speaker and audience are positioned in socially meaningful ways. In a dialogic approach to language, Bakhtin (1981 [1935]) claims that denotational text and interactional text depend on each other for their meaningfulness. But how do we construe this meaning? Poetics and indexicality can help us with this question.

Poetics and indexicality

The "poetic function" of language (Jakobson 1960) refers to the metered and recurrently positioned linguistic forms – such as phonological units, words, grammatical categories, and so on – in the structure of denotational text. Poetics is "a functional principle which motivates diagrammatic value within utterances" (Agha 1997:469). Simply put, poetic patternings are constructed as interactants repeatedly mark what's relevant to the conversation. As these linguistic forms are recurrently positioned, metrical poetic patternings take shape. For example, in the panel discussion, the first schema of culture emerges as the poetic patterning constructs a particular movement through space that is plotted by categories to which the teens are recruited. These are both life trajectories from birthplace to current residence (e.g., "your countries" to "America"), and trajectories which link nation-states to cultural value (e.g., "Cambodian values", "American society"). Audience members also use contrastive connectors – such as "or", "and" and "versus" – to mark these categories in opposition to each other. Poetics, then, contributes both to the denotational text by identifying meaningful categories in the events being discussed, as well as to the interactional text by mapping speech event participants into these categories.

Poetics is also useful in mapping "indexicality" in discursive interaction. Indexicals are words, such as pronouns, which cue both text-internal "cotextual" relationships (what is said before and after) and text-external "contextual" relationships (aspects of the situation) (Silverstein 1998:270). Therefore, indexical forms rely on both surrounding cotext and context ("co(n)text") for their meaningfulness, while making salient particular aspects of co(n)text (Benveniste 1971 [1954]; Hanks 1992; Peirce 1932; Sebeok 1990; Silverstein 1976). For example, a speaker may utter "we" to index a group that she belongs to, but how do participants know if "we" indexes a group that the interlocutor also belongs to ("inclusive-we") or not ("exclusive-we")? Participants can look to what is said before and after the utterance of "we" (cotext), or to groupings of participants based on gender, occupation, etc. (context). And depending on which meaning is made relevant, participants can construe the kinds of relationships being constructed among speech event participants.

This example roughly outlines the process participants undergo when making sense of indexical ambiguity. As such, indexical meaning can be achieved more easily in some conversations but not in others. This problem is only exacerbated by the indeterminacy of context (Silverstein 1992).

That is, context can potentially include almost anything in the universe – from the speaker's ethnicity to the weather outside – as long as participants themselves orient to these aspects. Thus, a mediated account of language use which relies on indexical patterns to collectively identify the meaningful aspects of context (and cotext) can assist participants as they construe meaning in conversation.

In her study of teacher-student conversations about jail, Rymes (1996) emphasizes how indexical forms are important resources that participants draw on to establish momentary alignments in interaction. In particular, she looks at pronouns which, like other indexicals, draw on surrounding co(n)text to construct their meaning. In the analysis of this panel discussion, the second schema of culture emerges as participants use pronouns such as "us" and "them", as well as non-pronominal indexicals such as "Cambodians" and "people" to create groups and draw boundaries between them. Speech event participants, then, are recruited to these indexically invoked categories. This process contributes to the interactional positionings among individuals and groups of people, including the panel and audience.

Participation frameworks

Both poetics and indexicality contribute to our construal of denotational and interactional textuality as the two schemas of culture emerge in the panel discussion. As it turns out, these schemas of culture are closely linked to "participation frameworks" (Goffman 1981). I use this term to include how participation is arranged in both the denotational text and interactional text. That is, who is interacting with whom in the events being discussed, as well as who is interacting with whom in the actual speech event, respectively. As the characters and events in the denotational text shift, so do the positionings of speech event participants in the interactional text. These shifts not only correspond to each other, but also with the two schemas of culture. Moving on to the analysis, we see how these two schemas of culture emerge through poetics and indexicality, and systematically relate to participation frameworks. In the conclusion, I will address why such shifts may occur.

Culture as "historical transmission": The first schema of culture

About fifteen minutes into the panel discussion, the first schema of culture emerges. Prior to this excerpt, teens were describing how boys and girls in their families are treated differently, and how the video addresses these concerns. Notice, then, that before the following excerpt, the participation framework in the denotational text involved teens interacting with family, home, parents and siblings.[3]

[3] Transcript conventions are located in Appendix A.

346	AF3:	what happens to families as- if- if you're in Americ- a- are y- w- all of y- were born- in-
347		your countries? or

Both spatial and temporal dimensions are laid out as a frame by AF3. That is, we have the present tense "you're in America" (you are) and the past tense "y- were born- in- your countries," along with the spatial distinctions between "America" and "your countries." Thus, the spatiotemporal dimensions of current residence in "America" and past birthplace in "your countries" emerge as meaningful distinctions in the question of "what happens to families." It is not yet clear what kind of transformation AF3 may be constructing. It is possible that she is invoking a cultural, rather than biological, notion of family which may be concerned with the consequences of transnational migration on cultural transmission. This vertical transmission along familial lineage may be called into question, but we do not have adequate evidence to make this claim yet.

In addition, AF3 utters somewhat of an oxymoron, "born in your countries," which presupposes that even if the teens were born in America, it is not their country. This resonates with the "permanent alien" construction of Asian Americans regardless of birthplace (Lowe 1996; Takaki 1989). This issue of birthplace, then, emerges as a meaningful category in the question of "what happens to families." It also creates a boundary between a category of "your countries" and a category of "not your countries," namely the United States. The contrastive connector, "or" (line 347), provided in the text contributes to this dichotomy. Already, in such a brief utterance, we see dichotomous categories emerging which position "America" in opposition to "your countries." Next, positionings along these trajectories become inhabited as teens are recruited to these categories in their reply to AF3's question:

348	Cham:	I was born in Thailand
349	AF3:	how about you?
350	Tha:	I was born here
351	Heng:	I was born here
352	Phila:	I was born in Cambodia but I came here when I was young so I don't know anything
353		much (.) if I came here older I would have experienced more? but I don't even
354	Angie:	Phal?
355	Phal:	born here
356	Angie:	okay

Cham, who was born in a refugee camp in Thailand, was neither born in "his country" nor in America. He doesn't seem to fit within the categories of nation-statehood in the emergent schema. The other teens, however, fit neatly into these categories: Tha, Heng and Phal were born in the United States, not "[their] countries," and Phila was born in "[her] countr[y]," Cambodia.

Thus far, denotationally explicit and implicit categories, such as family, birthplace, and current residence, have emerged to interactionally position speech event participants, namely the teens, within binary categories of nation-statehood. As the interaction continues, AM1 proceeds to fill out this schema introduced by AF3:

357	AM1:	how much- how much of what you're saying is a cultural value of Cambodia. that girls
358		are protected more are sheltered more and uh expected to (?) and how much of that i::s
359		(1.0) the American society where it's pushing (0.6) um::: (0.8) you guys are out there so
360		you know "hey I gotta play it a certain way" (0.7) a::nd maybe tell your little sister "I
361		don't wanna see you hanging around this (?) but we're- doing this (?)"
362	Heng:	'cau[se
363	AM1:	[how much of it is the socialization of the American rendition of Cambodian values
364		versus (.) Cambodian values
365	Heng:	'cause here in America? you see more bad people than in Cambodia so: if y- if you- if
366		you gonna leave your sister out and stuff? y'know in- in America y- you might be scared
367		for her you mi- no one will protect her. you scared she might get hurt or somethin'? get
368		raped or somethin'? but for a guy? he- he know how to protect himself 'cause he's
369		stronger than a girl an- and your parents- parents this- this- this is what your parents think
370		though. but. I don't really know though
371	A?:	((two or three audience members laugh))
372	Tha:	he(hh)h
373	Heng:	that's my point of view though

Added to the spatiotemporal frame laid out by AF3 is the introduction that each country has a culture (i.e., one country, one culture). Cultural values are distinctively linked to countries: "cultural value of Cambodia" (line 357), "the American society" (line 359), "the socialization of the American rendition of Cambodian values" (line 363), and "Cambodian values" (line 364). The contrastive connectors provided in the text – "and" (line 358) and "versus" (line 364) – continue the poetic structure of oppositional categories within this schema. In addition, notions of "(cultural) value" (lines 357, 363, 364), "society" (line 359), and "socialization" (line 363) emerge and contextualize AF3's utterance about "what happens to families" (line 346) within a more explicit discussion involving "culture." Thus, the schema is gaining more denotational and interactional weight as it collectively identifies familial categories ("family" (line 346), "parents" (line 369), "sister" (lines 360, 366)) as well as nation-states ("Cambodia" (lines 357, 363, 364, 365) "America" (lines 359, 363, 365, 366)), and interactionally positions teens as torn between oppositional cultural values as they move

along life trajectories. Next, the distinct division between the teens and their families becomes pivotal in this emergent schema:

374	AF3:	do you all stick with your families?
375	Tha:	what do you mean by that? (2.2) [(yeah)
276	AF3:	[are you all (.) involved with
		your families (.) in their
377		culture
378	Tha:	yeah
379	Heng:	yea:h
380	Cham:	°yeah°
381	Phila:	°yeah° °h(hh)°
382	Tha:	°h(hh)° (1.1)
383	AM1:	I- I- I guess- I guess my concern is are you lo:sing your culture

AF3 creates a division between "you" and "your families" (line 376) which differentiates "culture" into two emergent constructs: "your culture" (line 383), that of the teens, and "their culture" (lines 376-377), that of their parents or families. The teens, then, are constructed as having a "culture" distinct from others both in this (American) society, as well as in their (Cambodian) families. The question, "are you losing your culture" (line 383), seems to ask whether or not the teens themselves are holding onto this transmitted essence, namely their parents' culture.

It seems likely, then, that culture is emerging as a matter of authenticity, achieved only in "your countries," and either lost or mediated when a group migrates to a new country and becomes immersed in another culture. I argue that this first schema attempts to accomplish two things: 1) define culture as a matter of spatiotemporal, authentic and transmittable values occurring within families; and 2) deconstruct the authenticity of the panel – as if the hybrid "American rendition of Cambodian values" is somehow not the authentic "Cambodian values" and may lead the teens toward losing their culture as defined.

Notice that the audience members are positioned as the creators of this schema while the teens, their parents, sisters, and families – and not the audience members – are positioned as the inhabitors of its categories. These categories involve several distinctions: 1) a distinction between being born in a country and residing in a country; 2) a distinction between people who possess culture and those who lose it; and 3) a distinction between first-generation immigrants (the teens' parents) and the 1.5- or second-generation (the teens themselves).

What we have revealed, then, is that certain aspects of culture and identity are being indexed in interactional realtime. The mechanism of this indexing is the denotational poetics which builds up oppositional categories inhabitable by the teen panelists, but not the audience members. Categories such as these often essentialize the Asian American experience and oversimplify complex phenomena (Lowe 1996). They characterize identity issues as merely intergenerational tensions or conflicts between nation-states

and cultural value. Next, we will explore the second emergent schema which moves beyond this paradigm.

Culture as "emblem of ethnic differentiation": The second schema of culture

The second schema of culture begins where we left off – when AM1 asks, "are you losing your culture." Notice that this utterance is introduced by a member of the audience and, thus, is one to which the panelists are recruited by having to respond. This second schema emerges primarily through the poetic patterning of indexicals which comes to collectively presuppose certain co(n)textual features as meaningful to participants.

383	AM1:	I- I- I guess- I guess my concern is are you lo:sing your culture
384	AF?:	yeah
385	Heng:	not really though [(.) not- not really
386	AM1:	[naw:: not really because "All Means All" means that- that your culture
387		is valued
388	Heng:	well we try to bring our culture up because er- most people don't really know about our
389		culture so we try and bring it up
390	AF?:	mm hmm (0.7)
391	Heng:	try and let everyone know about it [y'know
392	Tha:	[we tryin' to put Cambos out there (1.0) [y'know (?)

After AM1 asks "are you losing your culture" (line 383), AF? utters "yeah" (line 384) which may display that she ratifies or shares AM1's question or concern. After Heng replies that he is "not really" losing his culture (line 385), AM1 invokes the title of the conference "All Means All" to metapragmatically frame that "your culture is valued" (lines 385-387).

In the first schema of culture, we noted how culture emerged as a construct of internal values transmitted within families, but Heng introduces culture as something to bring out into mainstream society: "we try to bring our culture up" (line 388). Culture, then, is emerging as some form of external display involving people other than their families. Heng indexes an exophoric category, "most people" (line 388), who are unaware of his culture and, therefore, the reason why his culture needs to be more visible and known to "everyone" (line 391). Tha ratifies this position and replaces the notion of "our culture" with an ethnic category "Cambos"[4] (line 392). It is from this point on that possessive pronouns completely drop off suggesting that we are no longer working within the first schema of transmittable and possessable values; rather, a new schema of ethnic categorization and

[4] "Cambos" is short for "Cambodians". "Cambo" and "Khmer" are the ethnic labels most often used by the teens when they discuss Cambodian ethnicity. According to a few of the teens, "Cambos" is used only by young people who are either Cambodian themselves or are "cool with" Cambodians.

division is emerging in its place. These categories are made explicit as the discourse continues:

393	Heng:	['cause most people
394		really know about Japanese Chinese and stuff we tryin' know abo- tryin' to know about
395		Cambodia and how they [was
396	Tha:	[yeah (.) we want to let people know that y'know like- this- thi-
397		it's not like all Chinese- not Asian people is all Chinese y'know like put like Cambos out
398		there. I wanna- I wanna walk down the street and then like (.) a Black guy be like (.) like-
399		well anybody could say "yo yo he Cambo" y'know?
400	Heng:	yeah not- not like (.) "are you Chinese"? y'know (1.0) not like that (1.4)
401	Tha:	[right now I'm tryin' to do somethin' to put Cambos out there. I'm tryin' to like- put out=
402	A?:	[((some audience members are talking among themselves))
403	Tha:	=a CD (0.6) so um like people know that y'know Cambos can do this too y'know? like
404		Asian people can do this (9.5)

Indexed throughout the above excerpt are categories of ethnicity, "Japanese" (line 394), "Chinese" (lines 394, 397, 400) and "Cambo(dia(n))(s)" (lines 395, 397, 399, 401, 403), as well as categories of race, "Asian" (lines 397, 404) and "Black" (line 398). This indexical patterning of race and ethnicity emerges to collectively presuppose these categories as meaningful to participants and central to this schema. Teens construct "culture" to involve not only themselves ("we" (lines 394, 396), "I" (lines 398, 401)), but also others ("(most) people" (lines 393, 396), "a Black guy" (line 398), "anybody" (line 399)).

"Most people" are constructed as unable to recognize and distinguish among ethnic groups within the Asian racial category. This is accomplished, in part, through the "voicing" of characters in the denotational text (Bakhtin 1981 [1935]). A "voice" is an identifiable social position. Speakers indexically presuppose particular recognizable voices for their characters in the denotational text. Speakers also take evaluative stances when voicing their characters. For example, when Tha voices "anybody" in a fictional world where Cambodians are recognizable, "yo yo he Cambo" (line 399), he is taking an evaluative stance on his own ethnic recognizability in American society (i.e., Cambodians are not recognizable). At the same time, through quoted speech, he makes recognizable the type of person he is voicing. This is accomplished by the linguistic utterances "yo" and "Cambo" accompanied by copula ellipsis in "he Cambo". These features collectively

mark African American Vernacular English (AAVE) or an "AAVE-influenced variety"[5] spoken by young people who are "cool with" Cambodians. Next, Heng voices the everyman in the current state-of-affairs, "are you Chinese" (line 400), which supports Tha's stance that Cambodians are not recognizable. Through patterns of indexical forms, the everyman of mainstream America emerges as a separate group apart from the teens, unable to ethnically recognize Cambodians or distinguish among Asian ethnic groups.

After Sapna gives names and phone numbers of school district officials to the audience, AF2 enters the discussion:

414	AF2:	I just had (to feel sorry) about what you just sai:d y'know (having) somebody being able
415		to walk up to you and say "well you're from Cambodia" but um: (0.6) yeah I just think
416		that- I just (?) culture? can't just walk up to somebody and decide where they're from?
417	Tha:	[no I'm not saying that [I'm not saying (?) no at least- at- at least they- I just want them=
418	Heng:	[no:: no
419	Cham:	[no:: no
420	AF2:	[I'm not just saying you can't (?)
421	Tha:	=to know that [y'know
422	Heng:	[no at least they can know about us y'know (.) but most people you ask
423		them I bet you they- they say they don't know nothin' about Cambodian. I bet you they
424		say they know a whole lot about Chinese, Japanese and stuff but you ask them about
425		Cambodians they be like "who's that what's that"
426	Sapna:	h(hh)mh(hh)m

Beginning with a metapragmatic evaluation "I just had (to feel sorry) about what you just said" (line 414), AF2 challenges this emergent schema. She reframes Tha's voicing of "them" from "yo yo he Cambo" (line 399) to "well you're from Cambodia" (line 415) to support her argument that one "can't just walk up to somebody and decide where they're from" (line 416). Three teens loudly proclaim "no" (lines 417, 418, 419) in response, and Tha and Heng defend the paradigm by making it a matter of "them/people" (lines 417, 422, 423, 424, 425) knowing about "us/Cambodians" (lines 422, 423, 425). Heng illustrates this by voicing "them" as saying, "who's that what's that" (line 425) when they are asked about Cambodians. Sapna, who is also Asian, responds with laughter (line 426) which may indicate ratification of Heng's predication or the comic effect of his voicing.

[5] "AAVE-influenced variety" is a provisional term I use to label language varieties which incorporate systematic linguistic features often attributed to AAVE. Although the variety spoken by these teens includes some of these features, such as copula ellipsis and distributive "be", there are other features which distinguish them apart (e.g., Khmer phonological influences). See Bucholtz (1999), Labov (1980), and Zentella (1997) for further discussion of AAVE influences on speech varieties.

From this configuration of denotational categories emerges an interactional text anchored in deictics. Speech event participants can be positioned in clearly defined groups of "we/us" and "they/them". The "we/us" category includes the Asian Americans in the room; that is, the teen panel, Asian Arts Initiative staff, and Sapna. The "they/them" category has recruited the rest of the audience. They are lumped together with the people who recognize Asians as only "Chinese" or "Japanese," an undesirable state-of-affairs that renders Cambodians an invisible ethnic category.

This second schema of culture, then, is more about inter-group relations among racial categories ("Asians," "Blacks," and "Whites" (invoked later in line 436)) and ethnic categories ("Cambodian," "Chinese," and "Japanese"), rather than about cultural transmission occurring within immigrant families. Unlike the first schema of culture, the second one has been constructed primarily by the teens themselves. The teen panel seems to have deconstructed the first schema asserting that they not only have "culture," but are also able to redefine it. Culture is not (or more than) a matter of authentic transmittable values, it is indexical of ethnic group membership and differentiation. This reformulation is accompanied by shifts in participation frameworks – both in the characters and categories in the denotational text, and in the participation and positioning of speech event participants in the interactional text.

Conclusion

The analysis of this panel discussion reveals that the conversation between the Asian American teens and the audience of teachers, advisors, and administrators both discursively invoked and established links between the following three categories:

a) Nation-states as places of birth and places of residence

b) Each (Asian) culture as an historically transmitted authentic essence

c) Cultural difference as emblematic of ethnic differentiation of people in (American) society

The transition from (b) "culture as historical transmission" to (c) "culture as emblem of ethnic differentiation" seemed to have been created by the question from the audience member, AM1: "are you losing your culture?" The question itself simply radicalized the tension between (a) spatiotemporal movements between nation-states and (b) their implications for the issue of authentic "historical transmission" occurring within families. The question asked, in effect, whether the last link in this chain of transmission, the teens themselves, are authentic recipients of this transmitted essence given their new conditions of socialization in America. Following the question "are you losing your culture," the second schema of culture,

that of (c) "emblem of ethnic differentiation", is then formulated by the panelists, mainly Tha and Heng, in response to AM1's question. Notice that this new schema involved a change in participation framework. That is, Heng and Tha located themselves – both denotationally and interactionally – in participation frameworks involving interaction with mainstream Americans; that is, denotationally with figures such as "most people", and interactionally with AM1, AF2 and other audience members.

The important issue to emphasize is that the two schemas of culture in (b) "historical transmission" and (c) "emblem of ethnic differentiation" are revealed to be not merely static essences, but dynamically linked to distinct participation frameworks. "Culture as historical transmission" involved interaction with families whereas "culture as emblem of ethnic differentiation" involved interaction with mainstream Americans, including the audience. Thus, individuals may be able to shift between schemas depending on the participation frameworks in play or the interactional exigencies at issue.

We have also seen how metadiscursive macro-essences such as "multiculturalism" and "identity politics" are locatable at the micro-level. Schemas of inner- and inter-group relations, cultural value, and ethnic and racial identity were discursively invoked and inhabited in this situated interaction. Rather than being nebulous constructs removed from daily conversation; to the contrary, they are very much experienced by virtue of being indexically invoked under the conditions derived from the interaction itself. Thus, notions of "culture" and "identity" are revealed to have two distinct properties: 1) their values are emergent in conversation, interactionally negotiated and, in fact, a performed reality; and 2) they are relational phenomena – that is, their characteristics are not inherent, but discernible only in relation to the denotational and interactional details in the conversation.

Finally, we must ask why this shift occurred. At the time AM1 asked "are you losing your culture," the teens were being positioned by the audience members in a paradigm which questioned their authenticity. AM1 then told the teens that their "culture is valued" (lines 386-387). Following that moment, an extended discussion of the politics of recognition unfolded. But why? We know that in this second half of the discussion, ethnic and racial categories divided groups into those that are recognized and those that are unrecognized by mainstream Americans. The teens also took up identities that positioned themselves as not only holding on to their unrecognized culture, but also actively bringing it out into mainstream society. Thus, the teens asserted that "losing culture" is not *their* problem, but the problem of mainstream Americans, because in order for their culture to be "valued" – a claim that AM1 made – it must first be recognized. This, I argue, is precisely the problem the teens identified: *How can their culture be valued if it's not even recognized?*

References

Agha, A. (1997). Tropic aggression in the Clinton-Dole presidential debate. *Pragmatics, 7*(4):461-497.

Agha, A. (1999). *The social life of cultural value*. Paper presented at the Ethnohistory Workshop, University of Pennsylvania.

Bakhtin, M. (1981 [1935]). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas.

Bauman, R. and C. Briggs (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual review of Anthropology, 19*, 59-88.

Benveniste, E. (1971 [1954]). *Problems in general linguistics*. University of Miami Press.

Bucholtz, M. (1999). You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3*, 443-460.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Rutledge.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.

Cicourel, A. (1974). *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction*. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hanks, W. (1992). The indexical ground of deictic reference. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350-377). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Jakobson, R. (1971 [1951]). *Selected writings*, Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton.

Labov, W. (1980). Is there a creole speech community? In A. Valdman, and A. Highfield (Eds.) *Theoretical orientations in creole studies* (pp. 369-388). New York: Academic Press.

Lowe, L. (1996) *Immigrant acts: On Asian American cultural politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Peirce, C. (1932). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, Vol. 2*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rymes, B. (1996). Rights to advise: Advice as an emergent phenomenon in student-teacher talk. *Linguistics & Education, 8*, 409-437.

Sebeok, T. (1990). Indexicality. *The American Journal of Semiotics, 7*(4), 7-28.

Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso & H. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 11-55). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Silverstein, M. (1992). The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough enough? In P. Auer and A. DiLuzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 55-76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In Lucy, J. (Ed.) *Reflexive Language*. New York: Cambridge University.

Silverstein, M. (1998). The improvisational performance of culture in realtime discursive practice. In R. Sawyer (Ed.), *Creativity in performance* (pp. 265-312). Greenwich, CT: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Silverstein, M. and G. Urban (1996). The natural history of discourse. In M. Silverstein and G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 1-17). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Spitulnik, D. (1997). The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 6*(2):161-187.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Willis, P. (1990). *Common culture: Symbolic work at play in the everyday cultures of the young*. Boulder & San Francisco: Westview Press.

Wortham, S. (1994). *Acting out participant examples in the classroom*. Philadelphia:

John Benjamins.
Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Zentella, A. (1997). *Expanding Repertoires*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Appendix

Transcription conventions

word	(underline) indicates utterance stress
word?	(question mark) indicates rising intonation
word.	(period) indicates falling intonation
word,	(comma) indicates falling-rising intonation
word-	(dash) indicates abrupt breaks or stops
wo:rd	(colon) indicates elongated vowel or consonant
°word°	(circles around utterance) indicates utterance is quieter than surrounding talk
wo(hh)rd	(hh) indicates laughter breaking into utterance
(.)	(period in parentheses) indicates a pause under 0.5 seconds
(0.5)	(number in parentheses) indicates a silence measured 0.5 seconds and above
[word [word	(brackets) indicates simultaneous talk by two or more speakers
word= =word	(equal sign) indicates continuous talk
(word)	(parentheses) indicates doubtful transcription or conjecture
(?)	(question mark in parentheses) indicates inaudible utterance(s)
((word))	(double parentheses) indicates transcriber comment

Angela Reyes is a doctoral student in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests include discourse analysis, linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and out-of-school educational sites for Asian American youth.

Avoiding FOBs: An Account of a Journey

Mihyon Jeon

University of Pennsylvania

This paper is an ethnographic record of an on-going journey during which I have tried to understand the kinds of language ideologies that my students and I have constructed about the Korean language and culture. My students are mainly Korean-American university students who have never successfully achieved native fluency in their heritage language although several attended Korean Saturday schools as children. I am their Korean language teacher. A special word, "FOB" (Fresh Off the Boat), which I have discovered during this journey, proved crucial to my understanding of my students' language ideology about the Korean language and culture. My language ideologies and those of my students appeared to be in conflict. My students were highly motivated to learn Korean, but they were opposed to Korean-English two-way immersion programs. I, however, strongly favored these programs. After a process of reflection, debate, journaling, and interviewing, I reached a new understanding reconciling the apparent ideological conflict that has separated me from my students. My findings suggest that attitudes toward the Korean language and culture are inextricably bound to their attitudes toward English proficiency and Korean immigrants.

Prologue

Excerpt 1

326	Jeff:	Yeah that's Dan, right? They say he's a FOB. He's called FOBby
327		it stands for Fresh Off the Boat.
328	Mihyon:	What is this?
329	Jeff:	It's like you just come from Korea

What is a "FOB" (pronounced "fahb")? This excerpt is from an interview (11/6/00) between Jeff[1], one of my Korean-American students, and me, his Korean instructor. Jeff was talking about Dan, who is also one of my students. They are both college students and enrolled in my elementary Korean course. Dan immigrated to the

[1] All names in this paper have been changed to preserve confidentiality.

United States when he was six years old, while Jeff was born and raised here. According to Jeff, "FOB" stands for "Fresh Off the Boat" and is used for indicating newcomers to the United States who do not speak English well and stick to their own people. The term "FOB" turned out to have significant meanings – which are discussed later – in my efforts to understand the difference between my ideologies and those of my Korean-American students for learning the Korean language and culture.

This paper attempts to present my itinerary of an on-going journey for understanding this issue – the conflicting ideologies among me and my students about learning the Korean language and culture. The paper reports what I have heard, felt, and thought during my journey so far. The writing style that I chose to use is personal narrative. It is somewhat autoethnographical in that I insert myself into the text as both researcher and participant (see Ellis and Bochner (2000) for further discussion on autoethnography). The first point of my itinerary was when I felt that I shared my students' attitudes toward the Korean language and culture as their heritage. The second point was when I was faced with a mismatch between what I expected my students' response to be and what their actual response was to Korean-English two-way immersion programs. At this point, I discovered that my language ideology was different from that of my students. The third point was when I learned about the word "FOB" and its negative connotation during an interview with Jeff. At this point I was able to understand that the word "FOB" represented my students' language ideology about the Korean language. The fourth point is now where I am trying to make sense of what has happened during my journey, while preparing for the next stop on my itinerary.

The organization of my paper is as follows. First, I give a narrative of a previous journey which tells about me and my background. My background clearly influenced my subsequent journey. Next I describe the beginning of my new journey with my students. Then, I conceptualize my journey in a theoretical framework, and show how my own ideology has been constructed by interactions between my own experiences and the literature. This part shows how I came to think that my assumptions and those of my students about learning the Korean language and culture are "language ideologies." Fourthly, I present methods that I employed in order to get around during my journey. Fifthly, I report what I have heard, felt, and thought at each point of my itinerary so far, based on various sources of data and my analysis of the data. The data for this paper were drawn from various activities with my students, some of which were dictated by my teaching goals and others by my research. Finally, in an epilogue, I present what this journey means to me.

A Previous Journey

I was born in Korea in 1971. With a BA in Elementary Education, I started

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teaching in a public elementary school in Seoul in 1994. Beginning in my third year of teaching, in 1997, English education at the elementary level was mandated by the Korean Ministry of Education. In 1997, only the third graders learned English, and I was one of the elementary teachers who had to teach them. Up to 1997 English had been introduced in the first year of junior high school. The first time when I was exposed to English was also my first year of junior high school, when I was 12 years old. Because my own English education focused only on written English, I had not yet learned how to speak English before I had to teach English to my students. The elementary English curriculum was focused mostly on spoken English, my weakness. As a teacher, I wished I could speak English better. I thought that I needed to learn English more completely and I wished to know how to teach it better. This was the reason why I came to the United States.

With great expectations, which later turned out to be illusory – that I would be able to speak English fluently after a one-year stay in the United States – I arrived in Pennsylvania in the Fall of 1997. Once I got here, I felt ashamed of my low English proficiency. I also felt that my Korean proficiency was not useful for anything except for my own personal needs. Whenever I was listening to and speaking Korean, it made me so comfortable. In the meantime I had a few chances to meet some Korean-American students who were born in the United States, and whose parents had immigrated from Korea to the United States. Even though their parents spoke Korean, these students were not able to do so. Through meeting these Korean-American 2nd generation students, I began wondering about the value of the Korean language within Korean-American families. While I wished I could be able to speak English as fluently as they did, I could not help but think that these Korean-American students had missed a great chance to be bilingual in both Korean and English.

During these three years I received an MA in TESL at West Chester University and started my doctoral studies in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. Even after more than three years' studying and living in the United States, I have never felt that my English was good enough. I have never felt comfortable speaking English. My discomfort in speaking English has made me recognize clearly how much I feel comfortable speaking Korean, and how valuable it is to me, even though it does not seem to be valued in the American society.

Commencing a New Journey

I started teaching Korean at the college level in the Fall 2000 without knowing that I would soon be doing research on the process. This teaching meant a lot to me because teaching the Korean language in a university in the United States was my first experience where learning Korean was valued at the American societal level. Soon my interactions with my college students led me to begin an investigation. During this study I had sixteen

Table I. Student Profiles

Name	Year	Age	Sex	Ethnicity	Immigration History	Attended Korean Saturday School	Favors Korean 2-way Immersion
Dan	Soph.	20	M	Korean-American	Immigrated age 6	No	No
Jeff	Fr.	19	M	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	No
Mike	Soph.	19	M	Korean-American	2nd generation	No	No
Lina	Fr.	19	F	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	Yes
Helen	Fr.	18	F	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	No
Alice	Fr.	18	F	Korean-American	2nd generation	No	No
Jane	Fr.	18	F	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	No
Kelly	Fr.	18	F	Korean-American	2nd generation	No	No
Jim	Soph.	20	M	Korean-American	2nd generation	No	No

Pill	Fr.	19	M	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	No
Sam	Soph.	19	M	Korean-American	2nd generation	Yes	No
Thomas	Fr.	19	M	European-American	Multi-generation	No	Yes
Ralph	Jr..	20	M	European-American	Multi-generation	No	Unknown
Harold	Grad.	50+	M	European-American	Multi-generation	No	Yes
Mali	Sr.	20s	M	Malaysian	Expatriate	No	Yes
Judy	Fr.	18	F	Korean & European American	2nd generation	No	No

All students had elementary proficiency in Korean.

students, eleven of whom were Korean-Americans, three who were European-Americans, one who was Malaysian, and one student whose mother was a first generation immigrant from Korea and whose father was a European-American. The table on the previous pages is a profile of the students, indicating each student's year in college, age, gender, ethnicity, immigration history, Korean proficiency, Korean Saturday school history, and each student's opinion on Korean-English two-way immersion programs.

Of the eleven Korean-American students, only Dan was born in Korea; the rest of the Korean-American students were born in the United States. They are mostly college freshmen and some are sophomores. They speak English fluently, but their Korean proficiency is low. With their strong desire for learning the Korean language and culture, they enrolled in my class. At the beginning of the semester, they showed their desire for learning the Korean language and culture in essays responding to why they wanted to do so. I was deeply moved by their essays which expressed both how much they have been frustrated by the fact they had not learned the language of their parents and of their heritage, and how much they wished to learn the Korean language and culture. As their Korean instructor, I also felt a strong responsibility for teaching them.

I believed that I understood my Korean-American students, in terms of what learning the Korean language and culture meant to them, until I was confronted with the fact that my students did not want to send their future children to Korean-English two-way immersion programs where both the Korean language and English language are used as the media of instruction. These programs aim to help both language majority students and language minority students develop balanced bilingual proficiency in Korean and English and cultural understanding through being enriched by each other. Two-way immersion programs are also referred to as two-way bilingual, bilingual immersion, dual language, or developmental bilingual programs (Christian 1994). The first two-way immersion program was implemented in 1963 at the Coral Way School in Dade County, Florida, in order to provide equitable educational opportunities for both native English-speaking majority students and native Spanish-speaking minority students (Pedraza-Bailey & Sullivan 1979). Recognized as an effective means of educating not only language minority students but also language majority students, two-way immersion programs have been receiving increased attention and funding in the United States since the early 1990s (Freeman 1998). According to the Directory of Two-Way Immersion Programs in the United States (http://www/cal.org/twi/directory), currently there exist 252 two-way immersion programs in 129 districts in 24 states in the United States. Although most of them are Spanish-English immersion programs (238 out of 252), there are four Korean-English immersion programs in California.

Learning about the existence of these four Korean-English two-way immersion programs was only my second experience of knowing that the

Korean language could be valued in public domains in the American society. I was very excited by the possibilities of these programs. I believed that they could be one of the best means of educating Korean-American children. However, my Korean-American students opposed the idea of sending their future children to these programs. Why did they not favor these programs? What kind of language ideology made my students reluctant to send their future children to these programs, even though they had a strong desire for learning the Korean language and culture? To understand our different and sometimes conflicting ideologies about learning the Korean language and culture was the goal for my journey.

A Compass for the Journey (Literature Review)

The way in which I perceive my students' and my assumptions about learning the Korean language and culture has been shaped by the literature. First, I started off with the concept of frames as a way of understanding my assumptions and those of my students. According to Tannen, a "frame" refers to "an expectation about the world, based on prior experience, against which new experiences are measured and interpreted" (1979: 17). Frames are also referred to as "scripts" (Tannen 1979:15), "schemata" (Tannen 1979:15), and "assumptions." Fairclough refers to "common-sense assumptions" (1995:84) which, in my interpretation, are interchangeable with frames. He further emphasizes that common-sense assumptions become an ideology when they serve to sustain unequal power relations (Fairclough 1995:84).

The book, *Language Ideologies* (Schieffelin et al. 1998) helped me to perceive these frames as "language ideologies." Heath defines "language ideologies" as "self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group" (1989:53). In my understanding, this definition of "language ideologies" shows that they represent the group members' social identities constructed in the process of their social experiences. Even though this definition does not explicitly recognize the power issue, a group may experience social relations of power regarding the group's language and culture. These experiences influence the group's social identities and their ideas about the roles of the language spoken by the group.

This concept provided me with the view that the frames my students and I have about learning the Korean language and culture are language ideologies. My students' reluctance to send their children to Korean-English two-way immersion programs is based upon their ideas about the roles of the Korean language, which were shaped through their experiences as members of this society. In my language ideology, the Korean language can be a resource not only for the Korean-American students but also for other students who have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This orientation toward language as a resource is introduced by Ruiz (1984)

and elaborated by Hornberger (1991). In my belief, Korean-English two-way immersion programs are places where both Korean and English play roles as resources for their students.

Woolard's conceptualization of the term "language ideologies" is based on a concept of ideology as "ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of struggle to acquire or maintain power" (1998:7). Woolard (1998) also introduces distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization as being central to the concept of ideology, a view which was originally posited by Marx and Engels. This concept of ideology as being distorted or mystified is constructed by the process of "naturalization" (Woolard 1998: 10). Woolard's concept follows Fairclough, who suggests that common-sense assumptions become naturalized and thus ideological when they are seen as *the* way instead of as being arbitrary (1995:91). This reminded me of my students' attitude toward English. Mike, one of my Korean-American students, said that "English is *the* language in this society and thus you should master it" (11/20/00). This means that Mike does not see English as arbitrary, but as the only language which he takes for granted as being used in this society. This naturalization of the English language is closely linked to the English-only discourse discussed in by Chick in this volume (2001). My Korean-American students' English-only discourse naturalizes the use of English in the American society and schools. Naturalization is one of several ideological strategies by which social relationships of power are established and sustained (Thompson 1990). In addition to naturalization, Thompson (1990) also suggests that stigmatization of discourse conventions of certain groups is also used as an ideological strategy for establishing and maintaining social relationships of power.

Even though these ideological strategies serve the functions of establishing and maintaining social relationships of power, language ideologies are not static. As Woolard argues, if ideologies compete in any society, some ideologies may continue to be held by people and some may be discarded in both societal and individual levels (1998:21). Chick (2001) suggests that each individual and each group has diverse and even contradictory social identities. These diversities and contradictions of social identities are also represented in my language ideologies and those of my students. Chick further asserts that "the subject has agency," citing Davies and Harré (1990:46) – "the individual emerges through the process of social interaction, not as a relatively fixed end product but as one who is constituted through various discursive practices in which they participate." This helps me perceive my Korean-American students as active subjects who have agency in shaping their language ideologies through the process of social interaction. My hope is that the differences between my students' language ideologies and mine might be lessened as we interact with each other and understand each other's points of view better.

Transportation for the Journey (Methods)

How language and roles of language are perceived and understood is discovered through investigating language ideologies, which can be discovered in everyday language usage. According to Woolard (1998), language ideologies are discovered in linguistic practice: 1) in explicit verbal expression about language – metalinguistic discourse; and 2) in implicit language use such as linguistic signaling through "contextualization cues" in Gumperz's (1982) terms. The major concern of this paper is to present competing and conflicting language ideologies about learning the Korean language and culture through analyzing both explicit metalinguistic discourses – what the participants say about learning Korean language and culture – and implicit language use regarding this issue.

In understanding my language ideology and those of my students by closely looking at our explicit and implicit language practices, my journey is based upon the ethnography of speaking proposed by Hymes. Hymes' ethnography of speaking posits the importance of considering a community's own theory of speech as part of any serious ethnography (Hymes 1974). A theory of speech that a speech community has seems to be represented by "norms of speech" and "norms of interpretation" (Hymes 1989). I am not interested in revealing the entire range of norms of speech and norms of interpretation that my students and I have. Rather I am interested in focusing on language ideologies which my students and I have, and which I consider as part of a community's own theory of speech. In my journey, I recognize a speech community consisting of my students and me. This recognition of our speech community is based upon an assumption that there exist many layers of speech communities. The speech community that I recognize is rather small in its size and is embedded in other, broader speech communities.

My language ideologies and those of my students are revealed, in various speech events, such as interviews, tape-recorded conversations between some of my students and their parents, journal exchanges, and e-mail correspondences. My students and I exchanged a dialogue journal three times during the semester. First, I asked my students to write an essay about the reasons why they wanted to learn Korean. I gave their essays back to them with feedback and a few questions focusing on their ethnic identities and language use with their family members. In a second journal, the students answered these questions. In the third exchange, I asked them whether they would be interested in sending their children to Korean-English two-way bilingual schools. After I received mostly negative answers, I conducted interviews with all of my students. Each interview (11/3/00 - 11/8/00) was between thirty minutes to one hour. With Dan, Kelly, and Jeff I conducted second and third informal interviews.

On the twentieth of November, I invited my students to my apartment. After having dinner, we had a debate about the Korean-English two-way

bilingual programs for about an hour. After the debate, I sent an e-mail to my students, asking them to tell me what they remember about what they said in the debate and their thoughts about it. Seven students replied, including Jeff, Lina (the only Korean-American student who favored the two-way immersion programs), and Thomas (who is one of the European-American students). This dinner meeting with my students was the second time to get together outside of the classroom. The first time was at a Korean restaurant after the mid-term exam. I tape-recorded conversations at the restaurant and recorded field-notes after the conversations.

I asked some of my students to audio record their conversations with their families, and I provided them with an audio tape recorder and a tape. Dan, Kelly, and Helen tape-recorded conversations between them and their parents during the fall break (10/12/00-10/15/00). I transcribed these tapes before the interviews with the students in which we discussed my interpretation of the tapes. These tapes provided me with valuable information about how the language ideologies of my students' parents are expressed in their conversations with their children.

In addition to these tapes, I had a chance to talk to Jeff's parents in person. I was invited to Jeff's parents' home for Thanksgiving dinner (11/23/00-11/24/00). I talked to both of Jeff's parents about various topics, including their experiences raising Jeff as a Korean-American and their regrets and hopes regarding Jeff's Korean proficiency. I also shared my half-written paper with Jeff and my hopes regarding the acceptance of the Korean-English two-way immersion programs. After the conversation, I felt that I understood Jeff's position better and hoped that Jeff understood mine. In addition, my experiences as a teacher at a Korean Saturday school provided me with a better understanding about how my Korean-American students felt and what they experienced while they attended Korean Saturday schools long before they attended my class.

What I Have Heard, Felt, and Thought

First point on my itinerary: "I wanna talk to my parents in Korean. Korean is my heritage."

Interested in knowing my students' motivations for and attitudes toward learning Korean, at the beginning of the semester I asked them to write an essay about why they were taking my course and why they wanted to learn Korean. Their essays told me both that they highly valued learning the Korean language and culture, and that they have suffered because of the fact that they looked Korean but couldn't speak the Korean language.

Kelly, who was born in the United States, said, "Because my ethnicity is Korean, I feel it is essential for me to learn Korean so I can speak it fluently one day and so I can maintain a better sense of communication with my family members." Mike, who was born here, said "A better understanding

in our relationship [between Mike and his parents] is the main impetus for my study of Korean."

Communicating with families as one of the reasons for learning Korean was mentioned repeatedly in other students' essays. All of the Korean-American students' parents were born in Korea and immigrated to the United States at various stages in their lives, but not early enough for them to be able to acquire native English proficiency. On the other hand, their children, my Korean-American students, speak English fluently, but their Korean language fluency is not sufficient enough to communicate with their parents in Korean. The students know that their parents feel more comfortable talking Korean rather than English. In the same essay, Mike mentions, "...Still although they [Mike's parents] have lived here for so long, because of their accents, they would rather have me or my brother speak to people for them in public, so I know that they always feel more comfortable communicating in Korean." Knowing their parents' feelings about using Korean and English, my Korean-American students want to learn Korean to communicate with their parents.

Alongside this desire for better communication with their parents, better understanding of their own heritage emerged as one of the reasons why the Korean-American students want to learn Korean. Mike stated:

Excerpt II

> ...**As I grow older, my own heritage has become increasingly more important to me.**[2] Ironically, my study of Spanish has fueled my change in thinking and desire to learn the Korean culture and language. I loved studying Spanish in high school ... Yet as I became more involved in Spanish, I honestly felt a sense of guilt, as if I were forsaking the culture of my parents and in doing so, in a way forsaking them. **I also realized that I want to be able to pass on to my kids some of the heritage and the language of my parents**...

Jeff also said that he believed that his parents wanted him to learn Korean so that he would not lose his Korean heritage. I deeply appreciated my students' desire for learning the Korean language in order to communicate with their parents in their heritage language. I also felt that I shared a similar attitude towards the Korean language with my students.

While I was exchanging journals with my Korean-American students, I was also teaching at a Korean Saturday school. From my teaching experience in this Korean Saturday school, I realized that it was hard to motivate

[2] Words in bold in the excerpts highlight the parts that I refer to in the analysis.

the students there because they did not want to come. Their parents forced them to come to study. When I asked my Korean Saturday school students why they came to my class, many of them answered that their parents made them come. Some of the Korean-American students in my college class shared their experiences with me about attending Korean Saturday school when they were young. Tom, one of the Korean-American students said:

Excerpt III

> **I was forced to go and had no desire to learn the language then**. I learned the characters and some basic grammar, but "Korean school" was a joke to me...We would fool around and would make fun of how poorly we read, which discouraged me from learning and shattered the small bit of confidence I had in my speaking and reading ability...**I think "Korean School" really had a negative effect on my learning the Korean language.**

Many other students said that they did not learn anything at Korean Saturday schools. I asked my Korean-American students why they thought they could not learn the Korean language Korean Saturday schools. They tended to attribute their inability of speaking Korean to their own faults or to their Korean Saturday school teachers' ineffectiveness in teaching the Korean language. In his second essay, Jeff told me that he did not learn much in Korean Saturday school since he was often absent because of cello concerts and sports events. He blamed only himself for the fact that he could not learn the Korean language.

On the contrary, I had different views about their inability to speak Korean. All these facts – 1) the Korean-American students did not learn much at Korean Saturday schools; 2) they are trying to learn the Korean language now because they did not learn it before; and 3) my Korean Saturday school students are unmotivated – seem to originate from the macro-level social structure in which the Korean language and culture are positioned. Through growing up in a society where English is dominant and is considered the medium of social and economic success, the students built a certain attitude toward the Korean language and culture. This attitude made the students less motivated for learning the Korean language and culture even though they were given a chance. That Korean-American children attend Saturday Korean school only once a week might send them messages that the Korean language is less important than English

Moreover, when I asked my students why they thought they could not learn the Korean language from their parents, some of my students told me that their parents never spoke Korean to them even though they spoke

Korean to each other. This may be an extreme case of this influence of the macro-level social structure regarding the Korean language and culture. Mike said that he had never learned Korean from his parents because they were afraid that he would fall behind in school if he learned two languages at once. Of course, Mike's parents never sent him to any Korean Saturday school. In the case of Dan, who came to the United States at the age of six, he was not sent to Korean Saturday school even though his mother was a teacher at one. Ironically, the other students who were sent to Korean Saturday school did not really learn Korean, and they are taking my Korean class with others like Mike and Dan who have never been sent to a Korean Saturday school. Efforts made by Korean parents, hoping their children would learn Korean at Korean Saturday school were in vain, at least in the case of my Korean-American students.

Up until this point, even though my Korean-American students did not have the same perspective as mine in accounting for their low Korean proficiency, I believed that we shared a similar language ideology because of their strong desire for learning the Korean language. I felt that we were ideological allies.

The Second point on my itinerary: "I do not want to send my kids to two-way immersion programs."

I was not able to realize that there was a conflict between my language ideologies and those of my Korean-American students until I asked them whether they would be interested in sending their future children to Korean-English two-way immersion programs. At these programs, both Korean and English are used as the media of instruction for enriching Korean-American students and other students whose linguistic and cultural backgrounds are different from those of Korean-Americans. I was excited to know about the existence of these programs, and I believed that Korean-Americans like my students would benefit from these two-way programs. With the expectation that my Korean-American students would welcome these programs, I asked them to write a response to my question. In the question I provided basic information about the programs in terms of student populations and the use of both Korean and English as the media of instruction, and I asked them whether they would be interested in sending their future children to Korean-English two-way programs. Except for one student, Lina, all of my Korean-American students said that they would not send their future children to these programs. I was shocked by their answers, and I was puzzled by the mismatch between my students' strong desire for learning Korean and their reluctance to send their future children to the Korean-English two-way immersion programs

Most of the students said that they opposed these programs because they believed that the programs would segregate Korean-American students and alienate them from mainstream American society. In the debate at my house, Dan said that if Korean-American students attended such

programs, they would associate with only Korean-Americans, segregating themselves from the rest of society. Secondly, my Korean-American students believed that these programs would prevent Korean-Americans from learning English fully. In his third journal, Mike said, "I don't know how justifiable this is, but my fear is that bilingual education will seriously hinder the English language and writing skills of its students." Thirdly, some students believed that two-way bilingual programs would harm the unity of the United States. For example, in his third journal, Pill said, "On the question of whether I would be interested in sending children to the Korean-English two-way programs I would be against such an idea...The reason I take such a strong position is for the reason of unity as a country, where if schools were allowed to choose the language they were to teach, what would stop the centralization of ethnicities across different regions of the country." The potentially harmful effects on the nation's unity, which my students believe about Korean-English two-way immersion programs, emerged in the debate.

When I was faced with my students' strong opposition to Korean-English two-way programs, the first thing that I did was to go back to their original reasons for why they wanted to learn the Korean language and looked closely at the language ideology expressed implicitly in their reasons. I wanted to make sense of the mismatch between my students' desire to learn the Korean language and their objections to Korean-English two-way programs. I tried to understand their opposition to Korean-English two-way immersion programs in terms of their language ideologies which I inferred from their expressed motivations for learning the Korean language.

As shown earlier, my students' desire is to learn the Korean language in order to communicate with their parents in Korean and in order to recover their Korean heritage. These reasons show that they have a certain language ideology about the Korean language and culture as something related to their parents, their families, and their own descendants. The Korean-American students identify the Korean language and culture as directly related to Korean person-hood. This language ideology suggests that my students do not expect that the Korean language and culture shoul be taught in school, because they feel that it does not fit into the mold of the American society. Therefore, it is their belief that the Korean language and culture belong only to Korean people, which includes my students and their families.

In contrast, my own language ideology about learning the Korean language and culture is different from those of my students. From my point of view, the Korean language and culture can be taught at school in such ways that Korean-American students and other students from different linguistic and culture backgrounds can benefit from being exposed to each other's languages and cultures. My course work as a graduate student studying bilingual education gave me a perspective which opened my eyes to the

fact that diverse languages and cultures can be seen as resources and rights, not problems. I gained this perspective from reading Ruiz (1984) and Hornberger (1991). In my students' language ideology, the Korean language and culture are seen to be hindrances for entering into American society. On the other hand, lack of Korean proficiency causes the students problems in communicating with their parents. They do not think that the Korean language and culture can enrich other people of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

The Third point on my itinerary: "Two-way immersion programs are for FOB's, not for my future children"

I did not realize that my understanding of my students' opposition to Korean-English two-way immersion programs was incomplete until I encountered the meanings of the word "FOB." The following excerpt describes the moment when I heard of the word "FOB" for the first time during an interview with Jeff. Just before line 326 in the excerpt, Jeff and I were talking about having Korean pride. I told Jeff that Dan is proud of being Korean.

Excerpt IV

318	Mihyon:	Do you think if you learn more Korean and the Korean history, do you think you'll be
319		more pride of being Korean?
320	Jeff:	I guess so.
321	Mihyon:	Do you know 영진 [Dan's Korean name]? He has a lot of Korean pride?
322	Jeff:	Yeah I can see that. The thing is when you look at him, when American people look at
323		him they can tell he's Korean though. I don't know it just like hair, how he talks and all
324		that and how he acts it's sort of like Korean.
325	Mihyon:	Oh what do you mean by that?
326	Jeff:	Yeah that's Dan, right? **They say he's a FOB**. He's called FOBby. It stands for Fresh off
327		the boat.
328	Mihyon:	What is this?
329	Jeff:	**It's like you [yourself] just come from Korea?**
330	Mihyon:	But he's been here for a long time.
331	Jeff:	Yeah he's been here such a long time, but when people look at him.
332	Mihyon:	What are the characteristics?
333	Jeff:	Yeah it's characterized by hair, 머리 [hair style in Korean], you know all Korean people
334		have long hair, I don't know, like an attitude.
335	Mihyon:	Attitude toward?
336	Jeff:	I don't know. I cannot describe. I guess when he talks. When you look at him when you
337		hear him talk, you just know that he's different from us.
338	Mihyon:	Why?
339	Jeff:	I don't know it's sort of weird. Like me I don't hang around with him. When you just

340		look at him you just know that kid can be Korean.
341	Mihyon:	I don't see any differences.
342	Jeff:	But other people know. Other people in our Korean class, they're like so scared when
343		first he came in.
344	Mihyon:	Why?
345	Jeff:	Because he seems like he looks Korean. And he talks pretty well too.
346	Mihyon:	What is the origin of this word?
347	Jeff:	Fresh off the boat, Do you know 배 [ship in Korean]?
348	Mihyon:	Yeah, is this from boat people?
349	Jeff:	No, 배 that you have to use to across the sea to come here.
350	Mihyon:	But you have to use plane.
351	Jeff:	We use plane, it should be Fresh off the Plane, but we always use FOB.
352	Mihyon:	What kind of language is it?
353	Jeff:	I think Asians just made it up. Like.
354	Mihyon:	Is it a noun?
355	Jeff:	It's a noun describing a type of person.
356	Mihyon:	Oh I just learned this word today. He's been here more 10 years
357	Jeff:	Yeah, he's been here that long too.
358	Mihyon:	But he said, "I'm like acting like Korean and I'm proud of having Korean norms."
359	Jeff:	That's really good though, but I don't know how he acts when he's around other White
360		people though. For me to see him with other White people is strange. He just hangs out
361		with only Korean people. I think that's something that people wanna avoid.

During our conversation, I was not able to recognize that the word "FOB" has negative connotations. I was just overwhelmed by the new word and by the fact that some of my students felt that Dan was different from them. Later, through e-mail correspondences with my students, I realized the negative connotations of the word "FOB." Jeff said that FOBs always hang out with other FOBs, speaking only Korean to each other and acting like Koreans with Korean attitudes instead of acculturating into the American society (e-mail correspondence, 11/22/00). In his e-mail (11/27/00), Mike also said, "...in general this word has negative connotation... but I don't know where the negativity comes from."

After I learned the negative connotations of the word "FOB," I closely analyzed the original interview with Jeff. I noticed that Jeff was expressing implicitly the negative connotations of the word "FOB" in the interview with me. In line 326, Jeff said, "They say he's a FOB." Jeff was using the pronoun "they" instead of "we" or "I" even though Jeff himself considered Dan as a FOB. The use of the third person pronoun, as a contextualization cue, signals both that the word "FOB" has negative connotations and that Jeff wants to exclude himself from ones who use the word to label others. In line 329, by saying "It's like you just come from Korea," Jeff was emphasizing the fact that "FOB" refers to people just new to this country. By empha-

sizing the only one aspect of "FOB" – being new to this country – which does not directly imply any negative connotations, Jeff seemed to disguise the full meaning of the word "FOB." He also included me, his teacher, in the category of FOB. This supports that Jeff was trying to make the negative connotations of the word "FOB" neutral. His use of the adverb "just" also signals that Jeff was trying to make the meaning of "FOB" less negative and less serious. Throughout the lines from 330 to 359, Jeff tried to say that the word "FOB" just refers to someone who is new to this country and who looks and acts Korean. Jeff did not imply directly any bad connotation out with only other Korean-Americans. This means that they do not want to be mistaken for FOBs.

The word "FOB" provided me with a better understanding about what the Korean language means to my Korean-American students. The word "FOB" is invested with the Korean-American students' language ideology about the symbolism of the Korean language and culture in the American society. My Korean-American students believe that if a Korean-American cannot speak English well and only speaks Korean, s/he is a FOB who will not be accepted by American society. This belief means that proficiency in Korean and not in English will stigmatize the speaker as an outsider who cannot be accepted by society and who also cannot achieve economic and social success. In this belief, even though the Korean language is their heritage, it is a thing that they should put aside until they can speak English fluently in order not to be FOBs. In this belief, only after mastering English can one put an emphasis on the Korean language as one's heritage. This explains what makes it possible for my Korean-American students to take my Korean class. Because they speak English fluently, they do not need to worry about becoming FOBs. Once they have achieved English proficiency, they are in a position where they can appreciate the Korean language as their own heritage.

My understanding of the negative connotations of the word "FOB" enabled me to get a better insight about why most of my Korean-American students did not want to send their future children to Korean-English two-way immersion programs. In his e-mail, Jeff mentioned that many Korean-American students in the debate responded negatively to the Korean-English two-way programs because they believed that these programs would make Korean-American students become more "FOBby" (an adjective form of the noun "FOB"). To the Korean-American students, being a FOB is something they should avoid. They perceive that the Korean-American two-way programs are catering to FOBs. How could they be interested in sending their future children to these programs where they believe their children would become FOBs, which they themselves try to avoid? Dan says that he does not see any advantages of these programs except for those who have just immigrated to the United Sates (see excerpt VII). By saying that, he means that these programs are for FOBs, not for his future children. In the debate at my house (11/20/00), the other Korean-American students

also agreed with Dan that these programs might be appropriate only for newcomers from Korea to the United States. This means that these programs are not for them or their children, but only for FOBs.

The word "FOB" is also associated with an orientation toward language as a problem because my Korean-American students consider FOB's Korean proficiency without English fluency a big problem. It makes them stick together and remain permanent outsiders from society. In addition, FOBs are perceived by my Korean-American students as usually being poor. In the debate, Jane said that new immigrants are generally poor. She also says that if new immigrants' children go to these Korean-English two-way immersion programs, the school cannot be good in terms of school facilities and quality of education because the parents will be poor and, thus, the schools will be too. The word "FOB" represents not only how the Korean-American students perceive language and roles of language but also how they perceive immigrants. As long as the Korean-American students associate the Korean-English two-way programs with FOBs, they will refuse to use these programs.

The negative connotation of Korean proficiency without speaking English fluently was shown in a conversation between Dan and his father. The following except is from a conversation between Dan and his parents when Dan's parents gave him a ride back to school after the fall break on 10/15/00.

Excerpt V

1	Dan:	근데 요새 난 발음도 인제 못하겠어 미국말만 했더니까 You know what I'm saying?
2		*By the way, I cannot pronounce Korean because I speak only English.*[3]
3	Mom:	응응.
4		Yes, yes
5	Dan:	엄마 자꾸 R 발음이 나와, 나오기 싫은데
6		*Mom, 'R'-sounds comes out, even though I don't want to say them. [when he speaks Korean]*
7	Dad:	괜찮아. Don't worry about it.
8		*It's okay.*
9	Dan:	왜요?
10		*Why?*
11	Dad:	한국말을 잘 하면 영어발음이 나빠져. 너는 결국 여기서 살 거기 때문에 영어는 확실히 해야돼 알아?
12		***If you speak Korean well, your English pronunciation will get bad. Because you'll***
13		***eventually live here, it is English that you have to speak well. Do you know that?***
14	Mom:	(laugh)
15	Dan:	네, 아버님. (using a loud and playful voice)
16		*Yes, (honored) father.*

[3] Words in italics are my own translation from Korean to English.

This excerpt shows that Dan's father may be inhabiting the role of a wisdom-carrier or an advisor to his son, Dan. In lines 11 and 12, Dan's father says that Dan should be able to speak English well because he lives here and that Dan's ability to speak Korean will prevent him from speaking English fluently. This reveals Dan's father's language ideology about the Korean language as a barrier to living in this society. In fact, an interview with Dan (11/3/00) reveals that his father kept Dan away from other Korean kids and did not send him to a Korean Saturday school where Dan's mother was teaching. In the interview with Dan, he shows that he understood why his parents decided to keep him away from the Korean language and culture.

Excerpt VI

16	Dan:	My parents didn't send me to Korean school, alright?
17	Mihyon:	Was it available available?
18	Dan:	It was available. **They didn't send me, they didn't send me because they wanted me to**
19		**excel in English. They wanted me to adopt this country.** It kind of helped because I
20		don't have many Korean friends back at home town. Most friends are white, but it helped
21		me adapt. Do you know what I'm saying? Because it's kind of difficult to do, especially in
22		my neighborhood, we were like basically the only Asians.
23	Mihyon:	Aha.
24	Dan:	So it was very difficult for me to get accepted into the society. I was picked on a lot like
25		racist attacking stuff like that. So like it was difficult for me to adapt. So my parents did
26		worry. I had very bad type of experience (...) because like racism stuff like that (...)
27		because I wasn't accepted. **So my parents decided to put me they wanted me to adapt as**
28		**quickly as possible. So they put me away from Korean and Korean culture (...) The**
29		**good thing is I adapted very well and was accepted because I did everything they did.**
30		The bad thing is you know my language like fell down and my vocabulary fell down ah
31		that's it but the negative part about not sending me into Korean, I developed a desire to
32		learn more. In high school I became very Korean proud.

This excerpt shows that Dan's parents believed that the best way to be accepted by society was to learn English as soon as possible. They also felt that the best way to learn English was by being separated from Korean culture and people. This language ideology of Dan's parents, shaped by the macro-social structure regarding the social position of the Korean language, represents a folk theory about bilingualism. Kenji Hakuta says that "...[according to the folk theory of bilingualism] in order to learn English

you need to let go of your native language...If you invest energy into developing your native language, then you will take away mental energy left over for learning the second language..." (Hakuta's commentary in a video (1989) titled "New Town High School"). This is consistent with Dan's father's saying that if Dan speaks Korean well, his English pronunciation would go bad. I believe that this folk theory of bilingualism, which Dan's parents have and which is also pointed out by Hakuta, is another name for the concept of "language ideology," because this folk theory presents people's ideas about language and roles of languages in society.

Dan's parents' language ideology is found in Dan's objection against the Korean-English two-way immersion programs. In his journal (10/30/00), Dan says:

Excerpt VII

> "...I would not send my children to such schools. Not only is it isolating children from the society, it is also setting up more barriers in the already racial [racially] separated country. **I also do not see many benefits - except for those who just moved to the country** - for the children to be confused about learning a subject in two different languages."

Dan's parents' emphasis on being accepted by society is also expressed by Dan. This shows that Dan's parents' language ideology about the Korean language influences Dan's. Dan's parents are agents through which the influence of the macro-level social structure regarding the Korean language and culture is mediated to Dan. Dan believes that the Korean-American schools would prevent Korean-American students from being accepted by society. He also thinks that these programs would prevent students from learning English fully (11/20/00). He agrees with his parents that the Korean language is a barrier to achieving English proficiency and to being accepted by society.

The Fourth point on my itinerary: "Moving beyond conflict "

This section presents how what took place during my journey is interpreted in the wider social and policy contexts, focusing on the social relationship of power. My Korean-American students' language ideology represents the social relationship of power regarding the status of the Korean language and culture in the American society. The Korean-American students live in a society where their heritage language and culture are marginalized, and where the English language dominates the public discourse. Their view of the Korean language and culture directly reflects

how the Korean language and culture are treated in this society where English-only discourse is prevailing and the Korean language has low social and economic value. A Korean speaker without English proficiency is considered language-deficient. The Korean-American students stigmatize new immigrants or newcomers from Korea as FOBs in terms of their low proficiency in English and low familiarity with the American culture. My Korean-American students also naturalize the use of English. They believe that English is the language which serves to unify diverse people in the United States and, therefore, they privilege English over minority languages. My students' naturalization of the use of English and their stigmatization of Korean proficiency unaccompanied by English proficiency are two sides of the same coin. These two are different, but serve the same function in maintaining the established relationship of power regarding the social status of the Korean language and culture, ideological strategies that have been evident during my journey. I believe that my students' naturalization of the use of English and stigmatization of the Korean proficiency prevent them from accepting the idea of Korean-English two-way immersion programs. The Korean-English two-way programs represent a counter language ideology to that of my students. The existence of these programs challenges the language ideology rooted in monolingual and monocultural identity. The Korean-English two-way programs are advocating multicultural identities through providing their students with multicultural social and institutional contexts for constructing "multilingual identity" (Chick 2001).

The language ideology represented by the programs is new to most of my Korean-American students except for Lina. She is the only Korean-American student who has a positive attitude toward these programs, saying that bilingual schools are good for people. In her e-mail, Lina mentioned, "My friend went to a bi-lingual school and she is fluent in both French and English. Since she learned two languages from early on, she is fluent in both. I don't think going to a bi-lingual school was a handicap for her at all." Because of her friend's positive experience, Lina has a postive attitude toward the Korean-English two-way immersion programs. On the other hand, the rest of the Korean-American students are not familiar with bilingual education nor the Korean-English two-way immersion programs. The following is an excerpt from my first interview with Jeff.

Excerpt VIII

159	Jeff:	I think bilingual school does have its advantages, I think it's gonna be hard for people to
160		accept it.
161	Mihyon:	Because?
162	Jeff:	**Because it's too new. I can see it can be really helpful, but it's pretty radical. Radical,**
163		I mean it's really different from everything else, too new, and it's like people cannot accept it very well.

164	Mihyon:	But if they are well informed with advantages of the schools?
165	Jeff:	Yeah over time and they see practicality and are informed with these kind of schools or like
166		it's gonna be popular.

In line 162-163, Jeff acknowledges that because these programs are too new to him, it is hard for him to accept them. Mike also said "I don't know very much about this topic, and in deciding whether to send my child to a bilingual school, I would have to read studies related to this topic." I perceive that my students' reluctance to accept these programs stems more from limited exposure to this counter language ideology than from an unwillingness to accept different language ideologies from their own.

As evidence for my argument, I raise the fact that the Korean-American students have a strong desire for learning the Korean language and culture. My students have the language ideology prevailing in American society, which shows that they are influenced by the society in shaping their language ideology. On the other hand, they want to learn the Korean language and culture. Their desire for learning the Korean language and culture is not possible if their language ideology is totally determined by the social influence. Their desire for learning the Korean language and culture shows that they are not passively reflecting the social relationship of power. My Korean-American students show that they have agency by registering for my course, even without fully recognizing the meaning of their behavior. And yet they do not accept the idea of the Korean-English two-way immersion programs because they are still under the influence of the society they live in. The fact that they want to learn the Korean language but they do not accept the Korean-English immersion programs seems to be contradictory. This contradiction indicates their diverse and even conflicting social identities. This contradiction also sheds light on the potential to reconstruct and negotiate diverse language ideologies through the process of social interactions.

In providing evidence for this reconstruction and negotiation of diverse language ideologies, I turn to the e-mail of Helen, one of my Korean-American students. After having a few lengthy interviews with me, Helen said, "I never thought that American society had anything to do with my lack of Korean verbal skills...But after talking with my teacher, I realized that society also plays a major role in my embracing my Korean heritage." She is still not in agreement with me about the idea of Korean-English two-way immersion programs. However, her e-mail highlights that she is in the process of the reconstruction and negotiation of her own assumptions about language and society. This e-mail allows me to have hope that the distance between my language ideologies and those of my students will be diminished by interactions with each other and information exchanged in the interactions.

Epilogue

This paper reports my journey toward a better understanding of the conflict between my Korean-American students' language ideologies and my own. So far throughout the four points on the itinerary of my journey, I have found meaningful accounts for this conflict. My Korean-American students value the Korean language and culture as their heritage and have a strong desire for learning them. And yet they show their stigmatization of Korean proficiency unaccompanied by English proficiency in a word "FOB." They also naturalize the use of English in public domains. Their stigmatization and naturalization reflect the social relationship of power regarding the status of the Korean language and culture in the society in which they live. Their stigmatization and naturalization prevent them from accepting the Korean-English two-way immersion programs.

The fact that my Korean-American students have a strong desire to learn the Korean language and culture, while they are reluctant to accept the Korean-English two-way immersion programs, reveals their agency in constructing and negotiating their language ideologies. This contradiction also shows that language ideologies are not fixed and static, allowing me to hope to lessen the distance between my students' language ideologies and mine.

Throughout my journey, I have tried to define my role in the interaction with my Korean-American students. I am not only the Korean-American students' instructor who teaches the Korean language; I also have a role as a minority language activist. I made use of activities such as journal exchanges and interviews to facilitate my students' thinking about their own language ideologies, and to help them to be exposed to alternative and counter language ideologies in favor of multilingualism. This does not mean that I try to impose my language ideologies on my students. I have been conscious that my position as a teacher might make my students disguise their thinking and tell me what I want to hear. After knowing that I am in favor of the Korean-English two-way immersion programs, most of the Korean-American students are, however, still not in agreement with me about the value of these programs. This indicates that the students have independent opinions, and they do not always answer according to what their teacher wants to hear. I try to acknowledge and accept my students' language ideologies and to understand how their language ideologies and mine have been constructed in the process of social interactions.

This journey has been a starting point for my better understanding of this issue. More research lies ahead of me. I believe that even the story that I have shared here so far can give helpful insights to other minority language learners and their instructors.

References

Christian, D. (1994). Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages (Educational Practice Report 12). Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning

Chick, K. (2001). Constructing a multicultural national identity: South African classrooms as site of struggle between competing discourse. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 17* (1 & 2), 27-46.

Davies, B. and Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43-63.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity. In N. K. Denzain and Y. S. Lincoln. (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* (pp. 773-768). London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Language and Power.* New York: Longman.

Freeman, R. (1998). *Bilingual Education and Social Change.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Heath, S. B. (1989). Language Ideology. In E. Barnouw, et. al (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of Communications, Vol 2, (pp. 393-395). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hornberger, N. (1991). Extending Enrichment Bilingual Education: Revisiting Typologies and Redirecting Policy. In O. Garcia (Ed.). *Bilingual Education* (pp. 215 - 234). Amsterdam/Philadelphia; John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. (1989). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In Gumperz, J and D. Hymes (Ed.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Pedraza-Bailey, S. and Sullivan, T. A. (1979). Bilingual education in the reception of political immigrants: The case of Cuban in Miami, Florida. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.). *Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States* (pp. 376-94). Eastern Michigan University: Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal, 8*, 15- 34.

Scheffelin, B. et al. (Eds.). (1998). *Language Ideologies.* New York:Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1979). What is in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations. In R. Freedle (Ed.). *New Directions in Discourse Processing.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in an era of Mass Communication.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

University of California Extension (1989). New Town High School, Part 2. Center for Media and Independence Learning.

Woolard, K. (1998). Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In B.Schieffelin et al (Ed.). *Language Ideologies* (pp. 3-50). New York: Oxford UniversityPress.

(1989) Video: New Town High School, Part 2. University of California Extension. Center for Media and Independence Learning.

Mihyon Jeon is a doctoral student majoring in Educational Linguistics at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interest is language maintenance among immigrants through bilingual education.

"That's Too Bad": Hedges and Indirect Complaints in "Troubles-talk" Narrative

Mark A. Ouellette

University of Pennsylvania

In many cultures, the "troubles-talk narrative" is a speech event which builds solidarity between interlocutors through the indirect speech act of complaining and through face-saving strategies such as speaker "hedges" and listener "comisserative responses" as backchannels. The manner in which speakers perform such narratives, though, may differ. While an understanding of how troubles-talk is performed may help non-native learners of English avoid problems with miscommunication, limited research has investigated the discourse features necessary for them to do so. This study examines the discourse structure of troubles-talk narrative by comparing how female speakers of English, French, and Korean indirectly complain in separate language groups in English. The study reveals that while the general structure of troubles-talk is relatively similar among the three groups of speakers in terms of the Labovian elements of "narrative syntax," group differences involve the proportion of hedges to indirect complaints and the relative length of the troubles-talk narrative. The findings suggest that language teachers might instruct learners in performing troubles-talk effectively in order to provide for increased learning opportunities outside the classroom.

Oral narratives are an integral part of many cultures. They provide for, in some cases, an oral legacy in which values and beliefs are passed down from generation to generation. In other cases, they serve as theatrical entertainment, an engaging educational tool, or an informative method of reporting. For the individual, narratives even provide a life story in which the narrator may dialogically construct an identity both through the interaction with his or her audience and through the relationship with the characters or events that he or she describes. From the perspective of the researcher, the oral narrative is a unique linguistic phenomenon, as it can be analyzed in terms of its identifiable features, elements, and discourse boundaries. In addition, because of these identifiable features and elements, variation in its structure is easily controlled by the researcher when considering certain confounding social factors (Schiffrin

1981), such as race, gender, social status, and social distance. For this reason, oral narratives have been an appealing object of investigation in such fields of study as sociolinguistics, anthropology, and second language acquisition since they provide both useful ethnographic and linguistic information concerning a particular culture and its individual speakers.

In fact, over the past 30 years, there has been an increased amount of baseline research on how oral narratives are structured and performed (i.e., Bennett 1977 on verb voice; Schiffrin 1981 on tense variation; Bamberg & Marchman 1991 on binding and unfolding). Many studies have also focused on particular linguistic varieties, including both Hymes (1974) and Rickford & Rickford (1995) on Native American narratives and Labov (1972) on African-American narratives. More recently, linguistic anthropologists have examined and described the dialogic means by which individual speakers construct an identity through narratives within the structural frame that specific cultures provide (See Davies & Harré 1990; Rosenwald & Ochsberg 1992; Hermans 1996; Wortham 2000).

While this wide variety of research has revealed a distinctive structure and purpose for oral narratives within specific linguistic communities, the increasing probability of cross-cultural communication in an expanding global society necessitates further investigation into the extent to which the discourse structure of these communicative events are cross-culturally universal. Findings of such an investigation might assist learners of a second language in acquiring the linguistic, as well as sociolinguistic, competence necessary for building solidarity and providing for further interaction with native speakers outside the classroom (Wolfson 1989). At the intensive English program where this study was conducted, for example, miscommunication surrounding a particular type of narrative, what is here defined as the "troubles-talk narrative," might have been resolved by a more useful understanding of how and whether such oral narratives can cause conflicts between learners from different cultures.

Applying the findings of previous research in this area, the following study proceeds in order to examine (1) the structure of discourse produced during the "troubles-talk narrative," and (2) how this discourse structure, in a controlled context, can be compared across three different speech communities, using the investigative tool of discourse analysis. The results of this inquiry may have important implications for how ESL classes may help non-native learners of English to engage in cross-cultural interactions in which "troubles-talk" may occur.

Troubles-talk Narrative

"Troubles-talk," or "troubles-telling" as it has also been called, is an event which can involve, in part, the indirect speech act of complaining and may be considered as a specific type of oral narrative. As Boxer (1993) notes, the indirect complaint, borrowed from the work of D'Amico-Reisner

(1985) on disapproval exchanges, can be described as a non-face-threatening speech act in which the responsible party or object of the complaint is not present during the interaction within which the speech act is performed (106). As such, the indirect complaint becomes a solidarity-building device since it freely invokes the listener to engage in a series of "comisserative responses" to demonstrate attention and concern, or to maintain intimacy and stable social relationships. According to both Tannen (1990) and Michaud & Warner (1997), such comisserative responses frequently serve as backchannels or evaluative responses in an extended structure of discourse exchanges and might include expressions like "Oh, that's horrible!, "Yeah, I know what you mean," and "That's too bad."

However, troubles-talk is more than an isolated act of indirect complaining or griping. Boxer, for example, explicitly states that indirect complaints are only "*a component* of the troubles-telling (talk) speech event" (1993:106, emphasis added), frequently serving as the initial speech act. Additionally, Bayraktaroglu (1992) in a study on Turkish comisserative responses makes this distinction between the act of complaining and the event of troubles-talk in the following manner:

> When one of the speakers informs the other speaker of the existence of a personal problem, the subsequent talk revolves around this trouble for a number of exchanges, forming a unit in the conversation where trouble is the focal point...., [involving] the speaker who initiates it by making his or her trouble public, the 'troubles-teller, and the speaker who is on the receiving end, the 'troubles-recipient.' 'Troubles-telling' is the act which initiates troubles-talk (319).

Both Tannen (1990) and Michaud & Warner (1997) use the terms "troubles-telling" and "troubles-talk" synonymously. However, Bayraktaroglu clearly suggests in the above statement that the indirect speech act of complaining, what he calls "troubles-telling," should not be confused with the larger event of troubles-talk.

Considering Bayraktaroglu's distinction, troubles-talk, as seen as a larger unit of text distinct from the speech act of complaining, might be better termed as a type of oral narrative, because a comparison of both narratives and extended units of "troubles-talk" reveals similar discourse structures. In a study of the use of conversational historical present tense in performed narratives, for instance, Wolfson (1978) explains that orally performed narratives are theatrical events in which the performer or speaker attempts to gauge the interaction with an audience in order to get across a point of view, replay the action of the narrative, and allow the listener(s) to experience vicariously the drama of the incident (217). This "gauging" is consis-

tent with Goffman (1972) which claims that "almost all acts involving others are modified" since a person, whether intentionally or unintentionally, reveals to interlocutors how he or she values him or herself, others, and the interaction which is taking place (13).

An excerpt from the data of the present study demonstrates this type of theatrical performance in extended "troubles-talk." Particularly, in response to a question concerning who was the rudest person she had ever met, one subject responds to the backchannels of her interlocutors. The subject's responses are highlighted in bold, whereas backchannels are represented by brackets.

> I . . I was with a friend of a friend over this weekend [Yeah.] .. **well, I mean** I was with my girlfriend and her good friend and they're both doctors in New York City and her friend is just so nice . she's really nice to me and she's very nice to my friend and very nice to people I guess that she assumes or she considers her social peers. [No way.] ... **But no oh God**, is she rude to just the general person. [Huh.] ... **No, if you are a waitress**, if you are a taxi cab driver, if you are a shop keeper [Yeah], she is so completely condescending [Mmm.] and rude... **Yeah. So bad** that at the end of the night at one point the cab driver was. was screaming out the door, "you're a **bitch**."

This troubles-talk narrative is interesting for several reasons. First, it is consistent in its elaboration, as when the speaker states that her friends were doctors from New York City, a detail which contributes to the purpose of the story. Second, it is clear that the speaker is performing before an audience and attempting to convey the main point, since she is responding directly to verbal and, perhaps, nonverbal cues during interaction. For example, she uses expressions like "But oh God" and "bitch," adding an engaging emotionality to the account. In addition, she responds directly to audience backchannels in expressions like "well I mean" and "No, if you're a waitress" which occur in the transcript just after short pauses that are filled by backchannels from the other two interlocutors. However, these backchannels do not interrupt the speaker during her narrative, since the primary speaker remains in control of the interaction. Edelsky (1981) terms this control of a verbal interaction as "the floor," and states that while bids for control of the floor may be put forth by interlocutors, back channels do not serve this function (398). Edelsky further describes two different types of floor: a floor in which one primary interlocutor is the "floor-holder" and one in which floor involves a collaborative effort in which interlocutors share the floor in a "free-for-all" (383). These several interactional and

performative features concerning audience (e.g., "gauging," "backchannels," and "floor-holding") reveal that troubles-talk can assume narrative-like features.

Troubles-talk and Narrative Discourse

Labov (1972) suggests another pattern that is similar to troubles-talk. Labov states that the narrative is characterized by a recapitulation of past experiences in which a sequence of clauses match a sequence of actual events (359-60). In addition, the more fully developed narrative consists of a series of six definable elements, including the abstract or title (in which the narrator sets up the point of the story with something like "Have you heard the one about"), the orientation (in which the narrator provides the time, place, persons, and situation), the complicating action (in which the narrator recounts a series of events), the evaluation (in which the narrator indicates why the story is told through a series of "free clauses"), the result or resolution (in which the complicating action is resolved), and the coda (in which the narrator signals that the story has finished) (363). Similar to Labov's narrative, the more fully developed troubles-talk reveals these characteristics, especially if hedges are considered as evaluative narrative elements, and indirect complaints as a form of complicating action.

Hedges and Indirect Complaints

An additional element to the troubles-talk narrative, which is not included within Labov's framework, can be identified. This element has been termed here as a "hedge" (Brown & Levison 1978). A hedge in a troubles-talk narrative is an attempt on the part of the narrator to maintain his or her face while complaining so as not to seem too mean or critical in the eyes of audience members. As Brown & Levinson (1978) point out, face is the "consistent self-image or 'personality' by interlocutors," the image which they desire to maintain (61). It is because of the desire to maintain face that speakers engage in "positive politeness strategies," demonstrating closeness, intimacy and rapport between speaker and listener, and "negative politeness strategies," indicating social distance between interlocutors (2). If applied to the Labovian structure for narratives, devices such as a hedge (HG) might be understood as a specific type of evaluation of face in the narrative, and an indirect complaint (IC) as a specific type of complicating action.

But the question still remains as to how this troubles-talk narrative may differ cross-culturally. While a wide variety of research has focused on cross-cultural comparisons of individual speech acts (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1989, on requests and apologies; Trosborg, 1987, on apologies; Billmyer, 1990, on compliments; Einstein & Bodman, 1986, on expressions of gratitude; both Tokano (1997) and Olshtain & Weinbach, 1993, on direct complaints; Wolfson, 1981 on invitations and compliments), few studies have

compared the discourse structure of the troubles-talk speech event. Bayraktaroglu (1992) is one exception. However, while this study reveals the distinctive features of Turkish comisserative responses that can be compared to native-speaker baseline data, it does not address how troubles-talk is structured as a unit of narrative discourse during interaction.

The Study

This research study examines the discourse structure of such longer stretches of the troubles-talk narrative during the conversations of 3 groups of female subjects at a large urban intensive English program: native English-speaking American-born subjects, non-native English-speaking French subjects, and non-native English-speaking Korean subjects. The principal research questions for this inquiry are the following:

(1) How can the discourse structure of the "troubles-talk narrative" be described?

(2) How is the discourse structured similarly or differently between native English-speakers, Korean non-native English speakers, and French non-native English speakers?

Subjects

Nine subjects between the ages of 25 –30 volunteered to participate in this study and were placed into one of three conversation groups consisting of 3 subjects each: 3 native speakers of American English (Group A), 3 native speakers of French (Group F), and 3 native speakers of Korean (Group K). Only female subjects were selected so as to control for linguistic differences that may be attributed to gender. The subjects filled out information cards to determine age range, general language proficiency in English, social status, and social distance in order to control for each of these variables and to ensure that each group of subjects would be conversing under the same conditions, excluding the independent variable of native language background. Social distance, in particular, was determined by asking each subject to rate the other two members of her group on a scale of 0 to 6 (e.g., 0 for complete strangers; 3 for casual acquaintances; 6 for intimate friends). The following table represents the background information for each of the subjects in their respective groups. Subjects were assigned pseudonyms (e.g., A1, F1, K1) in order to identify their native language and to protect the privacy of each individual.

As Table 1 shows, the 3 groups of subjects maintain fairly stable and similar relationships with each other. The subjects are also approximately within the same age range (between 25-30) and are of approximately the same social status and distance. That is, each of the subjects rated her relationship with other members of her group between 3 and 4 in social distance, classifying group relationships as "casual acquaintances."

Table 1. Background Information

	N	Job	Marital Status	English Proficiency	Social Distance 1	2	3
K	K1	manager	married	advanced	-	3	3
	K2	teacher	single	advanced	3	-	3
	K3	student	single	high-intermediate	3	4	-
F	F1	teacher	single	advanced	-	3	3
	F2	teacher	married	advanced	3	-	3
	F3	teacher	single	advanced	3	3	-
A	A1	teacher	married	native	-	4	4
	A2	administrator	single	native	4	-	4
	A3	teacher	married	native	3	3	-

Data Collection

In the same small comfortable room, each of the three conversation groups were left alone and were videotaped discussing for 30 minutes five topics written on index cards which were designed to elicit informal troubles-talk narratives. Two topics (*) served as distracters for control of bias. These topics included the following in order:

(1) Countries You Have Visited*

(2) Favorite Actors and Actresses*

(3) The Worst Student in Your Class (do not mention his/her name)

(4) A Rude Person You Have Met (do not mention his/her name)

(5) The Recent Cold Weather

The first two topics were discarded as distracters, and the conversation about the latter three topics were transcribed, comprising a total of approximately 60 minutes of videotaped data.

Method of Data Analysis

In this study, troubles-talk narratives are analyzed in terms of their discourse structure in order to see what patterns emerge from the three groups of subjects. Two features are evident for all the subjects: ICs and HGs. Each IC, though often embedded within a specific complicating action, is treated as an individual instance or move that expresses a negative comment of the physical behavior, verbal behavior, or personality or characteristic of the object of the IC, contributing to the main point of the narrative (e.g.,

"rude," "is always swearing," or "totally self-absorbed," respectively). If the same IC is repeated later in the narrative, whether by repeating the same word or by merely repeating the same offending behavior or characteristic, it is counted as an additional feature in the narrative. The following excerpted sample demonstrates this method of identification for one unit of discourse (See Appendix for transcription conventions).

Table 2. Sample Indirect Complaints (IC) in Troubles-talk Narratives

	A1	A2	A3
1		I have one student who .. he. It's not	
2		that he's horrible, he just [ ] ..**he**	
3		**doesn't want to be here** and it's very	
4		apparent. He's trying..**he's havir.g**	
5		**a difficult time** distinguishing	
6		between personal and academic	
7		relationships and **he wants to charm**	
8		his way into the class instead of doing	
9	[Right.] $_1$	the work	[Oh.] $_2$
10		**[ ] $_1$ cause he's [ ] $_2$ really not**	
11		**interested. He just wants to be**	
12		**somewhere else**..	
13		and **he's quite verbal about that and**	
14	[That's hard.	because of [that **he's just not**	
15	because it affects the	**interested in being here** so **he's**	
16	other] students	**having a difficult time** so he **sits**	
17	too.=	**there]**	
18			=Yeah....XXX
19			(laugh)
20		Yeah. What about you? (looks to A3)	

In the narrative in Table 2, nine ICs (highlighted in bold) can be counted. It should also be noted, here, that one unit of discourse (i.e., one troubles-talk turn) is defined by its boundaries in Labovian terms. A troubles-talk narrative is initiated when the speaker presents an orientation to the story (i.e., she identifies the setting, person, etc.). The turn is terminated when either the speaker/narrator accomplishes the coda or when another speaker/narrator initiates a newly introduced abstract via self-selection or nomination by another speaker. Similar to Schiffrin's (1981) study of narratives, this troubles-talk narrative structure can be understood as a "bound unit of discourse" (45). And in this way, a narrative turn is not terminated when another speaker provides backchannels or comisserative responses to the narrative discourse, as Edelsky's (1981) discussion of backchannels and floor proposes. Based on the previous studies conducted by Labov, Schriffrin, and Edelsky, therefore, nine narrative discourse units are identified, one for each subject.

The HGs in this study are identified as moves grammatically external to the clause in which the IC occurs when the narrator either (1) qualifies negative ICs with a positive comment or disclaimer, (2) initially defers from performing a complaint but continues with the narrative regardless, or (3) provides an excuse to justify the behavior or characteristic of the object of the complaint. An example of an HG is the qualifying statement, "he's just not interested in being here" from Table 2 (lines 13-14). This HG is external to the IC clause since it is, in Labovian terms, a "free clause" of evaluation which suspends the complicating action of the narrative (361). In this troubles-talk narrative, the HG further qualifies the preceding critical statement that the narrator expresses and does not continue the sequence of actions to serve the purpose of the narrative. For the purposes of this study, internal HGs, such as "just" in the statement above, occur within the grammatical structure of the IC clause and are not counted in the analysis. Since both ICs and HGs are the most frequently used and most salient feature of troubles-talk narratives, instances of both features are counted for each subject's narratives and group means are calculated. The proportion of mean HGs to mean ICs is also calculated and compared across the groups. Finally, since there are large differences in the length of narratives, the mean number of lines of transcript for the narratives of each group is also calculated. The calculation of the length of narratives in this way allows for a more accurate analysis of troubles-talk for the three groups. And since standard transcription conventions are employed, the number of lines for the narratives serve as an appropriate and manageable calculation of length.

Results

The data in this study suggest three sets of findings regarding the troubles-talk narrative performed by the three subject groups. First, the findings reveal a similar structural pattern across subject groups, and this pattern broadly matches the structure outlined in Labov (1972). Second, the amount and proportion of hedges and indirect complaints for each group suggests group differences concerning the relationship between these two narrative elements. Third, the differing lengths of narratives for each group suggest that the quality of troubles-talk may involve not merely the amount of complaining or hedging, but also the extent to which these elements spread across the relative length of the discourse unit.

Structure of Troubles-talk Narrative

As a discourse unit with definable boundaries, the troubles-talk narratives for each of the three groups of subjects reveal a similar pattern. All three groups use Labov's categories to recount their narratives, initiating troubles-talk with an orientation and concluding with the coda. This pattern seems to frame the troubles-talk narrative so well that by the coda of most narratives of one speaker, the other interlocutors, at times, self-nomi-

nate (in 7 out of the 9 discourse units) and introduce their own narratives after this sequence. Two of the floor-holding narrators substitute the coda with a nominating move, such as "What about you?" Often the coda is initiated by a drawn out expression like "So:: . . ." and a pause, indicating to interlocutors that the floor is now open. It is these two characteristics (that is, orientation and coda) which may more clearly define the "troubles-talk narrative." The resolution and evaluation, although present in some narratives, is less frequent.

Further, the more fully-developed troubles-talk narrative reveals the extended sequencing of complicating actions as a series of independent clauses. In the one narrative about a woman in New York City described above, the orientation "I . . I was with a friend of a friend over this weekend" is clear. But, a continuation of the narrative demonstrates this sequencing of complicating action (highlighted below in bold). The subject (A1) narrates:

> So bad that at the end of the night at one point **the cab driver was . was screaming** out the door, you're a bitch. And I think **she has a problem** with that [ ] because **she was just like yeah whatever. Said something** else to him and just kinda, you know . . **she laughed** and **my friend laughed** and **he just kinda was trying to deal with driving** and then when **we got out, he basically started screaming** out the window, you're a bitch. Once we got totally out of the cab, **she got really mad and turned around** and like. . . And **I was just standing there** thinking. So. I'm so happy someone . . [ ] else agrees with me.

The subject here uses evaluative responses like "I think she has a problem with that" with "I think" serving as external HGs. Also, she narrates a series of complicating events which are matched with a sequence of clauses. Finally, the end of this excerpt demonstrates a coda punctuated by the expression "So" ("So. I'm so happy someone else agrees with me"). No abstract or resolution is evident in this narrative, but as will be discussed below, this fact does not undermine the claim here that troubles-talk can be termed as a narrative.

For both Korean and French subjects, the narratives assume structures similar to their American counterparts. In response to the same question about a rude person, both groups narrate their experiences. In Tables 4 and 5 below, the narratives are analyzed in terms of their structural elements. Complicating actions are highlighted in bold.

Table 4. The Narrative of a Korean Speaker of English

Abstract	NONE
Orientation	There are a lot of afrenche **they speak frenche** a lot **I don't understand**..
Orientation	Teacher divide five or four groups to discussion about something. The time just me and then two of three safrenche.
Complications	**They speak french I don't understand.** What's this? I don't understand.
Orientation	So when I together with Korean and one Japan or other country, **I try to speak** Korean. Ah, **English** .. because one person don't understand Korean
Evaluation	so I feel sorry
Complications	so I try to speak English. **Teacher didn't ask that** .. She don't .. **they don't mind that** so .. rude .. very rude .. Teacher don't ask about that so it's ok ...
Evaluation	Some times I get angry.
Coda	It's ok. So::

Table 5. The Narrative of a French Speaker of English

Abstract	Ah yes,
Orientation	we go to McDonald's .. ah .. ah ..
Evaluation	and it was ..terrible .. terrible,
Orientation	My sister came in October and I'm .. she's never been in England She's never been in the US. She's never been in an English-speaking country
Evaluation	so her English is kind of .. I don't know .. basic.
Orientation	And ah .. we went to order something where..
Complications	**the woman gave her such a hard time. She was said like .** What? don't understand. Eh: eh: eh: Can you .. ah .. can take care of her? **I didn't underst** .. and my sister ..
Evaluation	I felt so bad for her cause she came back .. she was .. like .. you know, I don't know, I don't know.

Complications	**She saying my English was so bad** and **I thought people don't pay attention** to me. They are so .. so rude. **They don't look at you** when you order. **Say like what do you want?** (rolls eyes) **do like this.** Or **say what do you want?** (looks down) like this. **They don't care** about you. **They don't respond**. [] or **they don't say, Hello.**
Resolution	No. No. This.. Never I will g..go there again.
Coda	So..How about you? (look to F2) Y..you..you..the rudest person you know.

In a broad sense, Tables 4 and 5 map out the narratives for each group onto the structural pattern of Labov's narrative elements in a manner similar to that of native English speaker narratives. However, as the tables above demonstrate, the data does not fit neatly into Labov's framework, as it is not always clear which parts of the stories fit into which categories. For example, the fact that, in the Korean narrative, the orientation seems to comprise a set of three distinct threads which collectively construct the setting (e.g., "they speak frenche," "teacher divide [the class]," and "I try to speak ... English") and the fact that embedded within these threads are possible complicating actions such as "I don't understand" makes the task of clearly mapping out the narrative difficult. The French narrative proves just as perplexing. Still, Labov's categories are useful if only to lay out a general structure for the troubles-talk narrative.

Another difficulty with the data is that the character or quality of group interaction between the three groups differs. For instance, the Korean and American subjects in this study perform narratives in distinct discourse units, framed not only by orientation and coda but also by a clear holding of the floor on the part of an individual narrator. That is, during the performance of a particular narrative in these two groups, the remaining interlocutors tend to respond using backchannels or comisserative responses. Even though French subjects frame narratives in the same way, the character of their interaction is somewhat different. Frequently, these individual subjects overlap narratives as Table 6 suggests.

Table 6. Sample Interaction of French Subjects' Troubles-talk

	F1	F2	F3
1	Yeah I know. I like when		
2	Americans speak French. I		
3	like that [ ] accent.	[Of course.]	[Oh yeah.]
4		Because maybe [ ] they are	[Hah.] (rolls eyes)
5		(inaudible).	
6			Oh, yes. This person say
7			to my sister. Or they say ..
8			they say .. like this
9			<<voulez vous couche
10			avec mo ..>> (with a slow
11			exaggerated speech) Like
12			they .. they know only this
13			sentence .. ah you know
14			this song .. the song that
15	[No. No. I don't know	[<<voulez vous couche	go, [<<voulez vous couche
16	this.]	avec moi, si soir>>]	avec moi, si soir>>]
17	(laugh)	(singing)	(singing)
18	Or, one guy said to me like		
19	.. in the store .. like		
20	<<merci bucoop, merci		
21	bucoop>> (Emphasizing		(laugh)
22	American r and p)	(laugh)	
23	(laugh)		
24		Or <<ce'st chovette le	
25		guignol>>.	
26	Yeah. Yeah. Like that guy		
27	.. in the store. He love the		[Yeah.]
28	French accent. [ ] That's		
29	so pretty (high pitch) [ ] So		
30	pretty. So cute. They have	[So pretty.]	
31	this thing about the French		
32	accent. I don't know. I		
33	don't know. They love ..		
34	the guys they love the		
35	French accent.		

This overlapping of narratives during the interaction between the French subjects is not evident during the interactions among the members of the other two groups (e.g., American and Korean). What is interesting in Table 6, though, is that while particular events and situations are narrated, including such characters as "sister" and "one guy," the interaction might be more broadly seen as a general discussion of stereotypes concerning the "Americans" and the "French" (see lines 1-2) (A. Reyes, personal communication, March 22, 2001). This observation is further supported by the pronominal shifts from 3rd person singular to 3rd person plural by both F3 and F1 (lines 6-7, 27-30), indicating that the narrative concerning the sister's experience is momentarily suspended in order to allow for a general reflection on American behavior. Additionally, this general discussion reveals

an extended sharing of the floor during which interlocutors, particularly F1 and F3, bid for the floor by introducing their narratives with orientations. F1 begins with "I like when Americans speak French" (line 1), interrupting F3's narrative about her sister's experience with a native speaker of English. F3 continues her narrative in line 6 until F1 interrupts again in line 18 with "Like that guy in the store." F2 makes no bid for the floor, providing only backchannels to the other two narratives. Such cases of overlap indicate that, during interaction, the troubles-talk narratives among the French subjects have a much looser, perhaps more general, structure in comparison to the narratives of either the American or the Korean groups. That is, the structure allows for successful bids for the floor. In this sense, interaction between French subjects during troubles-talk is characterized by what Edelsky (1981) describes as a collaborative "free for all" in floor-holding among interlocutors (383).

Relationships between Hedges and Indirect Complaints

Concerning ICs and HGs, the data yield another revealing finding. Once the total number of each subject's ICs and HGs are counted, and the mean number of the categories for each group are calculated, the resulting figures show that, in the case of these subjects, the Americans and the French use approximately the same amount of ICs (means 17.00 and 19.67, respectively). In addition, the two groups use approximately the same amount of HGs (mean 9.67 and 6.67, respectively). The Korean subjects, on the other hand, use fewer ICs (mean 10.33), yet their use of HGs (mean 5.67) is much

Table 7. Means and Proportions of Hedges, Indirect Complaints, and Narrative Length

	N	Total IC	Mean IC	Mean Length (lines)	Total HG	Mean HG	Ratio of Mean HG to Mean IC
	A1	18			8		
A	A2	14	17.00	42.34	9	9.67	.57
	A3	19			12		
	F1	23			9		
F	F2	19	19.67	18.67	5	6.67	.34
	F3	17			6		
	K1	9			6		
K	K2	7	10.33	25.34	4	5.67	.55
	K3	15			7		

closer to the use of HGs among American subjects. Table 7 reveals this comparison more clearly.

The discrepancy between the groups might seem to indicate that the Americans and the French are frequent "complainers" and that the Koreans are less so, since there is a mean difference in ICs between the American group and Korean group of 6.67, and between the French group and the Korean group of 9.34. However, once the proportions of mean HGs to mean ICs for each group are calculated, a very different picture is painted.

According to Table 6, American subjects, for example, tend to complain a little less than twice as much as they hedge. A close look at the transcript reveals that, roughly, for every two ICs, Americans generally perform one HG. Korean narratives demonstrate a similar pattern, although the subjects complain far less. Thus, despite the fact that Korean subjects use less ICs compared to the Americans, the proportions of their HGs to their ICs are fairly equal (that is, Americans with a mean proportion of .57 and Koreans with a mean proportion of .55). The French subjects, however, complain approximately the same amount as Americans with a minimal mean difference (2.67), but perform HGs only a third of the time (mean .34). A look at the French transcript reveals that, overall, for every three ICs, these subjects tend to perform one HG. It is not that the French subjects in this case complain so much but that they do not counter their complaints with hedges as often as the other two groups. Similarly, it is not that the Korean subjects refrain from complaining but that they tend to counter their indirect complaints with more frequent hedges. American subjects tend to lie somewhere in the middle.

Relative Length of Troubles-talk Narrative

The mean length of troubles-talk narratives for each group of subjects is a salient factor in analyzing the data as well. Because there are distinct differences in narrative length, an individual subject who complains and hedges the same amount as another subject but who performs a shorter narrative might, at first, seem as employing these narrative features in the same manner. However, another look at the data proves otherwise.

Table 7 shows that the mean length of narratives for American subjects is 42.34 lines in the transcript, followed by Korean subjects with a mean length of 25.34 lines, and French subjects with 18.67. If the mean lengths for each group are then compared to the mean ICs and mean HGs, a clearer understanding of troubles-talk for the groups can be achieved. For example, in the case of American subjects, the amount of ICs and HGs is minimal in relation to narrative length (17.00 and 9.67, respectively). That is, ICs account for a little less than one-fourth, and HGs a little less than one-tenth, of the mean narrative length. For Korean subjects, the amount of ICs and HGs are also minimal in relation to the mean length of narratives. In these cases, ICs account for approximately one-half, and HGs one-fifth, of mean

narrative length (10.33 and 5.67, respectively). ICs for French subjects, however, constitute the bulk of narrative length (19.67), but HGs account for approximately one-third (6.67). These findings indicate that the relationship between ICs and HGs, on the one hand, and the length of troubles-talk narrative, on the other, provide a more accurate description of how these subject groups utilize these features during interaction.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that troubles-talk narratives are complex events bounded by identifiable features similar to those described in Labov (1972). Further, this type of narrative can not only be considered as a discourse unit for the purposes of discourse analysis, but it can also be seen as "performed," in the Wolfsonian sense that they involve a narrator playing out a scene in front of a captive audience which provides comisserative responses. Therefore, with regard to the first research question of this study, (1) How can the discourse structure of the "troubles-talk narrative" be described?, the discourse of the troubles-talk narrative is identifiable and patterns out in a similar manner to the performed narratives in Wolfson (1978) and Labov (1972). However, the manner in which narratives are spread throughout interaction between interlocutors varies in terms of floor-holding, bids for the floor, and relative length of troubles-talk. In the case of the French subjects, a looser, more general quality is evident in troubles-talk during which interlocutors are able to maintain a "free-for-all" in floor-holding, while American and Korean subjects are not. Further, for the Americans and the Koreans in this study, the effect of face plays an important role in the structure of the troubles-talk narrative. In the data of this study, positive politeness strategies take the form of hedges. For the French subjects, positive face plays less of a role, since they use less hedging strategies in proportion to indirect complaints over the spread of the narratives. Regardless of this difference, however, the data suggest the following pattern of moves for troubles-talk narratives for all subjects:

(a) Orientation (required)

(b) Complicating Action (required, amount is optional)

- Indirect Complaint (required)
- Hedge (required, amount depending on the interlocutor's concern for face)

(c) Evaluation (amount is optional)

(d) Resolution (optional)

(e) Coda (required)

Because the troubles-talk narrative assumes the above general structure for sequenced elements in this type of narrative and allows for variation between subjects in their use of optional evaluation and resolution, distinct discourse units can be identified. In addition, because subject narratives allow for the effect of face through hedges, Boxer's (1993) statement that indirect complaints are non-face threatening may not apply to the subjects' speech in these narrative events. In this sense, subjects may be using hedges to save either their own face or the face of others because too much complaining may be viewed as an undesirable quality.

The second research question of this study addresses the similarities and differences between subject groups:

> (2) How is the discourse structured similarly or differently between native English-speakers, Korean non-native English speakers, and French non-native English speakers?

While some differences in the amount of indirect complaints are evident between both the American subjects and Korean subjects, the data shows that the two groups are similar in the proportion of hedges to indirect complaints. Also, these groups are different from the French subjects who complain just as much but use fewer hedges, especially in relation to their mean narrative length. The difference in the amount of indirect complaints and the length of narratives may be due to language proficiency. Since the Korean subjects are intermediate to advanced learners of English, and since the French and American subjects are proficient or native speakers, the discrepancy may be due to the Koreans' more limited repertoire of complaining strategies. However, this aspect of the present study does not undermine the results since the comparison of calculated proportions for the groups counter-balance the limiting factor of language proficiency by setting subjects on an even-keel in terms of how proficiency might affect the performance of troubles-talk narrative. That is, the study does not focus on the increased amount of complaining or hedging, which may be influenced by the variable of language proficiency. Rather, the study focuses on the relative character of such narrative features in relationship to each other.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the study involves the method of data collection and internal validity. Because the troubles-talk narratives were elicited through the use of topic index cards, the extent to which such a discourse unit reflects natural speech is questionable. For example, as stated above, abstracts in most of the subjects' narratives are not evident. As Wolfson (1989) indicates in regard to narratives elicited during interviews to collect samples of "natural speech," a researcher eliciting this type of data assumes that the narratives told are "not part of the question/answer pattern of the inter-

view" (69). In part, this is a valid criticism of such methods of data collection. However, for the purposes of this study, a possible baseline of data is, here, set up, despite its elicited nature.

Additionally, the sample size in this study limits external validity. Because only 9 subjects, 3 from each native language group, were selected on a volunteer basis and because random sampling was not possible, the assumption that these subjects represent their native culture's population confines the potential for generalizability. Furthermore, the length of stay in the U.S. is a factor which could have influenced pragmatic and sociolinguistic transfer on the part of the non-native speaking subjects. In this study, this factor is not taken into consideration. It is feasible, therefore, that non-native subjects may have performed narratives in an "American manner" for the purposes of the researcher. For these reasons, some caution should be taken in making any assumptions that the findings of this study suggest that native and non-native speakers of English generally structure the discourse of troubles-talk differently. Rather, this study should be seen as a pilot study which suggests a pattern or trend to be further investigated.

Future Research

Further research not only on troubles-talk but on complaining strategies, in general, is needed, and this study provides some implications for doing so. First, a more controlled study with a larger sample of the language groups is required, a study which further employs inferential statistics to ensure that the differences in the structure of troubles-talk are not due to random error. Second, subjects from different language groups might be studied to gain a better perspective on the range of structures employed in different cultures. And third, two or three methods for data collection should be used as tools for gathering a wide range of data to triangulate and come to a better understanding of the factors at work in the performance of this type of discourse structure.

As soon as such a body of research is conducted and the data analyzed and compared, the benefits to non-native learners of any language will be attainable. Learners who acquire competence in performing troubles-talk narrative, its characteristic indirect complaining and required hedging strategies in U.S. culture, may be able to break through the pragmatic and sociolinguistic boundaries of communication between themselves and native speakers. The ESL classroom can be instrumental in this regard. ESL instructors might provide direct instruction, as well as opportunities to practice such features, and might emphasize the role of this type of narrative in increasing opportunities for interaction and learning outside the classroom.

References

Bamberg, M., & V. Marchman. (1991). Binding and unfolding: Towards the linguistic construction of narrative discourse. *Discourse Processes, 14,* 277-305.

Bayrakaraglu, A. (1992). Disagreement in Turkish troubles-talk. *Text, 12,* 317-338.

Bennett, T. (1977). An extended view of verb voice in written and spoken narratives. In E. Ochs & T. Bennett (Eds.), *Discourse Across Time and Space: Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 5* (pp. 43-50). Linguistics Department, University of Southern California.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle": Learning how to compliment in English. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 6,* 1-25.

Blum-Kulka, S., & E. Olshtain. (1989). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5,* 196-215.

Boxer, D. (1993). Social distance and speech behavior: The case of indirect complaints. *Journal of Pragmatics, 19,* 103-125.

Brown, P., & S.C. Levinson. (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* New York: Cambridge University.

D'Amico-Reisner, L. (1985). *An ethnolinguistic study of disapproval exchanges.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Davies, B., & R. Harré. (1990). Positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20,* 43-63.

Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society, 10,* 383-421.

Einstein, M., & J.W. Bodman. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 167-185.

Goffman, E. (1972). *Interaction Rituals.* Hardmondsworth: Penguin.

Hermans, H. (1996). Voicing the self. *Psychological Bulletin, 119,* 31-50.

Hymes, D. (1974). Studying the interaction of language and social life. In D. Hymes, *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach* (pp. 29-66). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.

Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the Inner City* (pp. 354-396). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.

Michaud, S. L., & R.M. Warner. (1997). Gender in self-reported response to troubles talk. *Sex Roles, 37,* 527-540.

Olshtain, E., & L. Weinbach. (1993). Interlanguage features of the speech act of complaining. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka, (Eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 108-122). New York: Oxford University.

Rickford, J.R., & A. Rickford. (1995). Dialect readers revisited. *Linguistics and Education, 7,* 107-128.

Rosenwald, G., & R. Ochsberg. (1992). Introduction. In G. Rosenwald & R. Ochsberg (Eds.), *Storied lives* (pp. 1-18). New Haven: Yale University.

Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense variation. *Language Variation, 57,* 45-62.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Men and Women in Conversation.* New York: William Morrow & Company.

Tokano, Y. (1997). How people complain: A comparison of the speech act of complaining among Japanese and American students. *Sophia Linguistica, 41,* 247-264.

Trosberg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in native / non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11,* 147-167.

Wolfson, N. (1976). Speech events and natural speech: Some implications for sociolinguistic methodology. *Language in Society, 5,* 189-209.

Wolfson, N. (1978). A feature of performed narrative: The conversational historical

present. *Language in Society, 7*, 215-237.
Wolfson, N. (1981). Invitations, compliments and the competence of the native speaker. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics, 24*, 7-22.
Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Wortham, S. (2000). Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry, 10*, 1-27.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

[ ]	simultaneous speech
[ ]1 [ ]2	multiple cases of simultaneous speech in one line of dialog
Wonderful.	utterances that are stressed
XX XXX XXXX	inaudiable due to simultaneous speech
(inaudible)	inaudible due to softly spoken speeech
( )	non-linguistic or paralinguistic behavior
<< >>	utterances in a foreign language
.. ..	short pauses
=	interrupted speech
Eh: eh: eh:	short staccato speech
So::	elongated speech
"you're a bitch"	quoted speech

Mark A. Ouellette is a doctoral candidate in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include academic literacy and academic competence at the post-secondary level. More specifically, he plans to explore how non-native English-speaking undergraduates in freshman writing programs negotiate academic literacy practices concerning voice, authority, and plagiarism.

Information for Our Contributors:

The goal of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)* is to present works in progress by students and professors on topics ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition. Papers included in *WPEL* are generally based on research carried out for courses offered in the Language in Education Division of the Graduate School of Education.

It is our intention that *WPEL* will continue to be a forum for the exchange of ideas among scholars in the field of educational linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and at universities with similar programs in educational and applied linguistics around the world. *WPEL* is sent to more than one hundred universities world-wide.

WPEL is published each Fall and Spring. The regular subscription price is US$ 8.00 per issue. Academic departments and commercial publications are invited to arrange an exchange subscription by sending the editors of this journal one copy of their working papers (or similar publication) in exchange for each requested copy of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*.

1.Submissions to *WPEL* cannot be under consideration for publication elsewhere unless permission has been granted by the other publications. In this case, it is the author's responsibility to obtain the necessary permission and citation. We ask that any *WPEL* article published elsewhere at a later time include a reference to *WPEL*. The individual authors retain copyright privileges.

2.Submissions should follow APA guidelines and must include an abstract of no more than 125 words.The methods section of any submission must be sufficiently detailed so that it could guide the replication of a similar study.Editors make every effort possible to ensure the accuracy of all citations; however, the final responsibility for citations remains with the author of each article.

3.Articles not accepted for the current issue may be rewritten and resubmitted for a following edition. A recommendation to rewrite is not a guarantee of future publication in *WPEL*.*WPEL* is not responsible for returning articles that have been sent to our office. Please, do not send an original paper, and do not send articles on diskette until asked to do so.

4.This journal recognizes the difficulty in using gender-neutral language. However, we are committed to avoiding the clumsy he/she construction and the use of plural pronouns for the singular antecedent. Therefore, we encourage authors to find their own solutions within these guidelines. All correspondence should be addressed to:

Working Papers in Educational Linguistic
Language in Education Division A-12
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut St.
Philadelphia, PA. 19104

Telephone: 215.898.3288
Fax: 215.573.2109
Email: wpel@gse.upenn.edu Web: http:/www.gse.upenn.edu/wpel/

130

EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTICS
READING/WRITING/LITERACY
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
TESOL

Courses:

Sociolinguistics

TESOL Methodology

Structure of English

Educational Linguistics

Second Language Acquisition

Language Diversity in Education

Multicultural Issues in Education

Classroom Discourse and Interaction

Language Planning and Language Policy

Social and Historical Perspectives on Literacy

Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners

Forming and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum

For detailed program information, please write:

Admissions Office
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216

Internet: http://www.gse.upenn.edu/

working papers in educational linguistics

Volume 17, Number 1 & 2 Spring/Fall 2001

Articles in this issue

Nancy Hornberger
Educational Linguistics as a Field
A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of Its 25th Anniversary
1

Keith Chick
Constructing a Multicultural National Identity
South African Classrooms as Sites of Struggle Between
Competing Discourses
27

Stanton Wortham
Accomplishing Ambiguation: Shakespeare
Identity Positioning in Classroom Interaction Discourse
47

Angela Reyes
Constructing Identity and Asian American Issues
A U.S. Study District Conference Panel Discussion
65

Mihyon Jeon
Korean EOBs: An Account of a Learner
83

Mark Ouellette
Dude, Too Bad
Hedges and Boosters in Computers in Human Behavior
107

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

132

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").